

Vol. 23 No. 4

Outstanding McGraw-Hill Books



INDUSTRIAL SOCIOLOGY: The Social Relations of Industry and the Community

By EUGENE V. SCHNEIDER, Bryn Mawr College. *McGraw-Hill Series in Sociology and Anthropology*. 559 pages, \$6.75.

Depicts the social structure of the large-scale industrial organization, and the relationship between this structure and the employees. With a detailed, competent attention to unionism, it shows how labor unions are related to this social structure and social relations of industry. Includes a description of the newly merged AFL-CIO.

URBAN SOCIOLOGY

By EGON E. BERGEL, Springfield College. *McGraw-Hill Series in Sociology and Anthropology*. 556 pages, \$6.50.

Treats "urbanism as a way of life," stressing urban culture, social action, group relationships, and community organization. The ecological description of New York and Paris serves to lay the empirical foundation for conceptualization and for a sociological theory of urban life. Special attention is given the relationship of groups with different religious or ethnic backgrounds, the treatment of minorities, and population problems.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY

By ALVIN L. BERTRAND, Louisiana State University. Ready in Fall.

This outstanding text by Professor Bertrand and 16 associates presents the American rural society of today, as it is, dynamic and in transition. It explores the impact of population shifts, technology, modern means of communication, formal education, and contemporary agricultural policy. New topics include: Communication and Technological Change in Rural Society; and Community Development Programs.

HUMAN ENGINEERING

By ERNEST J. MCCORMICK, Occupational Research Center, Purdue University. 467 pages, \$8.00.

A nontechnical introductory survey book dealing with the design of equipment and the adaptation of work environments for optimum human use. It summarizes much of the work that has been done in human engineering by such professions as physiology, psychology, and anthropology. An understanding of these functions is developed through discussion of human information-receiving, decision-making, and action processes.

McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

330 West 42nd Street

New York 36, N. Y.

Send for
copies on
approval

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Official Journal of the American Sociological Society

VOLUME 23

AUGUST, 1958

NUMBER 4

Editor

CHARLES H. PAGE

Associate Editors

WALTER FIREY

NOEL P. GIST

ALVIN W. GOULDNER

FRED L. STRODTBECK

MANFORD H. KUHN

CLARENCE C. SCHRAAG

MELVIN SEEMAN

VINCENT H. WHITNEY

WENDELL BELL

MIRRA KOMAROVSKY

PHILIP RIEFF

PETER H. ROSSI

Book Review Editor

MICHAEL S. OLMSTED

Editorial Staff

ELY CHINOV

NEAL B. DENOOD

MARY E. W. GOSS

ALFRED HARRIS

ALLEN H. KASSOF

GEORGE F. MAIR

MARGARET A. MARSH

Executive Officer

MATILDA WHITE RILEY

THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is published at 372-374 Broadway, Albany, New York, bi-monthly in February, April, June, August, October, and December. Copyright © 1958 by the American Sociological Society.

★ Membership dues of the Society, including subscription, are \$10.00 per year. Subscription rate, \$8.00. Single issues, \$2.00.

Four weeks' advance notice to the Executive Office, and old address as well as new, are necessary for change of subscriber's address.

Contents

- Social Stratification and the Functional Theory of Social DifferentiationWALTER BUCKLEY 369
Class Consciousness and Political SolidarityOSCAR GLANTZ 375
Community Power Structures and PartisanshipROBERT E. AGGER AND DANIEL GOLDRICH 383
The Ecology of the American City: Further Comparison and Validation of GeneralizationsCALVIN F. SCHMID, EARLE H. MACCANNELL, AND MAURICE D. VAN ARSDOL, JR. 392
Automation in the Automobile Industry: Some Consequences for In-Plant Social StructureWILLIAM A. FAUNCE 401
Randomization and Inference in Sociological ResearchROBERT MCGINNIS 408

RESEARCH REPORTS AND NOTES

- "Bureaucratic" Elements in Organizations: Some Research FindingsSTANLEY UDY, JR. 415
Alienation and Mental IllnessROBERT SOMMER AND ROBERT HALL 418
Distance of Migration and Socio-Economic Status of MigrantsARNOLD M. ROSE 420

COMMUNICATIONS

- On *Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*HOWARD BECKER 424
On "Social Power and Commitment"R. A. SCHERMERHORN 425
Reply to SchermerhornE. ABRAMSON, H. A. CUTLER, AND R. W. KAUTZ 426
Class and Behavior—A ReplyMARTHA S. WHITE 427

THE PROFESSION: REPORTS AND OPINION

- Florian Znaniecki, 1882-1958THEODORE ABEL 429
R. Richard Wohl, 1921-1957DONALD HORTON 430
Official Reports and Proceedings
Report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, 1958.. 430
Constitution of the American Sociological Society 431
By-Laws of the American Sociological Society 432
The Need for Nationwide Marriage and Divorce Statistics: CommentTHOMAS P. MONAHAN 437
Highlights of the Third Indian Sociological CongressMARGARET E. SHAY 440
"Informal Sociology": A Proposal for a New PublicationHERBERT J. GANS 441
Can We Develop a Program of Recruitment?..CLAUDE C. BOWMAN 442
News and Announcements 443

BOOK REVIEWS

- Wittfogel: *Oriental Despotism*. W. Eberhard 446
Brown: *Science and the Creative Spirit*. Bernard Barber 448
Nef: *Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization*. Bernard Barber 448
Clark: *War and Society in the Seventeenth Century*. M. D. Feld.. 449
Altick: *The English Common Reader*. J. Jean Hecht 450
Baltzell: *Philadelphia Gentlemen*. William Miller 451

Concerning Manuscripts and Book Reviews address

Editorial Office

4 Tyler Annex
Smith College
Northampton, Massachusetts

Concerning Advertising and Subscriptions address

Executive Office

New York University
Washington Square
New York 3, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Albany, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 23, 1925, embodied in paragraph 4, section 538, P. L. and R., authorized June 4, 1938.

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS FOR THE YEAR 1958

President, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., Cornell University
President-Elect, KINGSLEY DAVIS, University of California, Berkeley
Vice-President, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, University of Washington
Vice-President-Elect, HARRY ALPERT, National Science Foundation
Secretary, WELLMAN J. WARNER, New York University
Editor, CHARLES H. PAGE, Smith College
Executive Officer, MATILDA WHITE RILEY, Rutgers, The State University

COUNCIL

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
 KINGSLEY DAVIS
 ROBERT E. L. FARIS
 HARRY ALPERT
 WELLMAN J. WARNER
 CHARLES H. PAGE
 LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR.

Former Presidents

DONALD YOUNG
 HERBERT BLUMER
 ROBERT K. MERTON

Elected at Large

REINHARD BENDIX
 ROBERT BIERSTEDT
 AMOS H. HAWLEY
 DAVID RIESMAN
 HARRY ALPERT
 ROBERT E. L. FARIS
 REUBEN HILL
 GORDON W. BLACKWELL
 JOHN A. CLAUSEN
 W. F. COTTRELL
 PRESTON VALLEN

Elected from Affiliated Societies

JAMES H. BARNETT
 LEONARD BROOM
 HUGH CARTER
 DOROTHY K. NEWMAN
 WILLIAM H. SEWELL
 RAYMOND F. SLETTO
 MARION B. SMITH
 T. LYNN SMITH
 GEORGE B. VOLD

Executive Committee

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
 KINGSLEY DAVIS
 ROBERT E. L. FARIS
 HARRY ALPERT
 ROBERT K. MERTON
 WELLMAN J. WARNER
 CHARLES H. PAGE

Elected by the Council

AMOS H. HAWLEY
 RAYMOND F. SLETTO
 JOHN A. CLAUSEN
 WILLIAM H. SEWELL

Sklare: <i>The Jews</i> . Milton L. Barron.....	452
Snyder: <i>Alcohol and the Jews</i> . Arnold M. Rose.....	453
Blanshard: <i>American Freedom and Catholic Power</i> . J. Milton Yinger.....	455
Shields: <i>Democracy and Catholicism in America</i> . J. Milton Yinger..	455
Miller: <i>American Protestantism and Social Issues 1919-1939</i> . Bryan R. Wilson	456
Goddijn: <i>Katholieke Minderheid en Protestantse Dominant</i> . William Petersen	457
Gittler: <i>Review of Sociology</i> . William L. Kolb.....	458
Stein and Cloward: <i>Social Perspectives on Behavior</i> . Joseph W. Eaton	459
Schneider: <i>Industrial Sociology</i> . Harold L. Wilensky.....	460
Wilensky and LeBeaux: <i>Industrial Society and Social Welfare</i> . Zena Smith Blau.....	461
Ginzberg and Reilly: <i>Effecting Change in Large Organizations</i> . Robert Dubin	462
Gross et al.: <i>Explorations in Role Analysis</i> . Everett K. Wilson....	463
McCorkle et al.: <i>The Highfields Story</i> . David Matza.....	464
Cohen et al.: <i>The Sutherland Papers</i> . George H. Grosser	464
Higgins and Fitzpatrick: <i>Criminology and Crime Prevention</i> . Walter C. Reckless	465
Morris: <i>The Criminal Area</i> . Gresham M. Sykes.....	466
Self: <i>Cities in Flood</i> . Richard Dewey.....	466
Pinkney: <i>Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris</i> . Richard Dewey	466
Hatt and Reiss: <i>Cities and Society</i> . Scott Greer.....	467
Vidich and Bensman: <i>Small Town in Mass Society</i> . Gerhard E. Lenski	468
Sower et al.: <i>Community Involvement</i> . David L. Sills.....	469
Coleman: <i>Community Conflict</i> . John B. Knox.....	470
Winnick: <i>American Housing and Its Use</i> . Marion T. Loftin.....	471
Beyer and Rose: <i>Farm Housing</i> . Marion T. Loftin.....	471
Commission on Chronic Illness: <i>Chronic Illness in a Large City</i> . George Rosen	471
Fitzsimmons: <i>Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic</i> . Witold Krassowski	472
Kosa: <i>Land of Choice</i> . P. J. Giffen.....	473
Hart: <i>New India's Rivers</i> . William E. Cole.....	473
Roberts: <i>The Population of Jamaica</i> . Leonard Broom.....	474
Clarke: <i>My Mother Who Fathered Me</i> . R. T. Smith.....	474
Goody: <i>The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups</i> . Gordon D. Gibson	475
Farnsworth: <i>The Social Psychology of Music</i> . Adolph S. Tomars..	475
Sanders: <i>The Community</i> . Blaine E. Mercer.....	476
Phelps and Henderson: <i>Population in Its Human Aspects</i> . Lincoln H. Day	477
Boulding: <i>The Skills of the Economist</i> . Neil J. Smelser.....	478

BOOK NOTES

Schlesinger: <i>How They Became Governor</i> . John P. Mallan.....	478
Ostrander: <i>The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933</i> . C. Wendell King	479
Laves and Thomson: <i>UNESCO: Purpose, Progress, Prospects</i> . A. B. Overstreet	479
DuBois: <i>Multivariate Correlational Analysis</i> . Karl F. Schuessler....	480
Rodriguez: <i>Sociologia General</i> . Manuel Duran.....	480
Germani: <i>La Sociologia Cientifica</i> . Manuel Duran.....	480

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(Articles in the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals and in the Weekly Bulletin of Public Affairs Information Service.)

American SOCIOLOGICAL Review

August
1958

Volume 23
Number 4

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND THE FUNCTIONAL THEORY OF SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION *

WALTER BUCKLEY

System Development Corporation

THERE has been no dearth of criticism of the Davis-Moore theory of social stratification since its publication over a decade ago.¹ Particularly disturbing is the fact that what this theory views as virtues (eufunctions) are the very factors that others overwhelmingly see as vices (disfunctions). The former characterize it in terms of competitive achievement of position; a close correlation between superior capacities, importance of position, and high rewards; and its functional necessity to maintenance of the social system. The critics associate the theory with role-ascription and restriction of opportunity; absence of correlation between superior capacities, rewards, and positional importance; and disruption or discontinuity of the society. This gross difference of views has led several sociologists to seek out and find deficiencies in the functional theory. Among other shortcomings, its critics² have pointed out that the Davis-

Moore theory is inadequate in its treatment of the concept of "functional importance"; it ignores possible disfunctions and functional alternatives of stratification; it reifies "society" as "inducing" its members to assume positions and play roles; and in general it accepts outmoded concepts and assumptions of classical economics, such as "inherent scarcity" of social ends and the inviolability of competition, all of which results in a picture of theoretical necessity that reproduces with remarkable faithfulness a culturally circumscribed ideology. The view expressed by Lester F. Ward over half a century ago would seem to be still relevant:

... here we encounter the great sullen, stubborn error, so universal and ingrained as to constitute a world view, that the difference between the upper and lower classes of society is due to a difference in their intellectual capacity, something existing in the nature of things, something pre-ordained and inherently inevitable. Every form of sophistry is employed to uphold this view. We are told that there must be social classes, that they are a necessary part of the social order.³

The widespread acceptance of this theory in introductory sociology texts,⁴ along with

Review, 20 (August, 1955), pp. 424-430; Richard L. Simpson, "A Modification of the Functional Theory of Social Stratification," *Social Forces*, 35 (December, 1956), esp. p. 137.

³ Lester F. Ward, *Applied Sociology*, Boston: Ginn and Company, 1906, p. 96.

⁴ For example, see Arnold W. Green, *Sociology*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952. He states, on page 217: "Stratification is universal because it is neces-

* Condensed version of a chapter of the writer's unpublished doctoral dissertation, "Sociological Theory and Social Stratification," University of Wisconsin, 1958.

¹ Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moore, "Some Principles of Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, 10 (April, 1945), pp. 242-249.

² Cf. especially the critique of Melvin Tumin, "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis," *American Sociological Review*, 18 (August, 1953), pp. 387-394. See also Melvin Tumin, "Rewards and Task-Orientations," *American Sociological Review*, 20 (August, 1955), pp. 419-423; Richard D. Schwartz, "Functional Alternatives to Inequality," *American Sociological*

the recent appearance of Bernard Barber's detailed presentation of essentially the Davis-Moore functional view, demands further thought on the question of why the many cogent criticisms remain unanswered, and especially why so much of current American sociological theory in this area remains isolated from and incompatible with the voluminous European and earlier American literature.

The present paper is concerned, not to review or revive earlier criticisms, but to point out what we believe to be a heretofore neglected basic conceptual flaw in the current functional theory of stratification and a problem focus that has still to be faced by an adequate theory. Whereas the excellent critique of Tumin and others was aimed mainly at the substantive content of this theory, the present analysis is aimed primarily at its methodological deficiencies.

To put the issue simply, and as the title of this paper suggests, the current functional theory of stratification is not a theory of stratification at all but something that more closely resembles a theory of certain aspects of social differentiation and hierarchical organization—a distinction, our argument insists, that is not merely one of arbitrary terminology.⁵

To begin with, it will be recalled that the Davis-Moore theory specifies the central defining criterion of the concept of stratification as follows: "If the rights and perquisites of different positions in a society must be unequal, then the society must be stratified, be-

cause that is precisely what stratification means."⁶ We shall argue, however, that this is not precisely what stratification has meant to most students. It is (or was) rather firmly embedded in usage that stratification involves the existence of *strata*, generally agreed to refer to specifiable collectivities or subgroups that *continue through several generations* to occupy the same relative positions and to receive the same relative amounts of material ends, prestige, and power. The statement quoted above, on the other hand, refers only to the fact of the differentiation of social positions as seen at any one point of time, and implies nothing about the existence of strata, which, to extend our above definition, implies groupings of individuals with biological and social continuity whose movements into the differentiated positions can be predicted to some degree (if only statistically).

Past stratification studies of importance have usually viewed strata, whether implicitly or explicitly, as historical developments. Without going back further, we recall the Marxian framework:

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed. . . .

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and exchange. . . .

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed. . . .⁷

And certainly Pareto's "circulation of the elites," Veblen's "leisure class," and Weber's "life-chances" and "life-style" lose much of their meaning outside of a developmental framework.

Turning to the early American sociological pioneers, we note that Ward and Cooley stressed continuity and inheritance of position as basic to class. Thus, for example, Cooley—who preferred the term "caste" or "caste principle" to refer to what we mean by strata or stratification—wrote:

When a class is somewhat strictly hereditary, we may call it a caste—a name originally

sary." It is of interest to note, however, that in the second edition, 1956, of this text the above statement is changed to read merely: "Stratification is universal."

⁵ The distinction between stratification and differentiation has been made in some detail by, among others, Wiese-Becker, *Systematic Sociology*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932, and Cecil C. North, *Social Differentiation*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1926. The latter uses "social differentiation" as the generic term, subsuming under it the four main types: differences of function, of rank, of culture, and of interests.

And at least one other student of stratification has noted this basic flaw in Davis' theory: "Davis attempts a functional explanation of social stratification but, in fact, explains only social differentiation." Harold Pfautz "Social Stratification and Sociology," *Transactions of the Second World Congress of Sociology*, Vol. II, London: International Sociological Association, 1954, p. 320, footnote 18.

⁶ Davis and Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

⁷ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "The Communist Manifesto," in V. F. Calverton (editor), *The Making of Society*, New York: Random House, Inc., 1937, pp. 340, 341, 346.

applied to the hereditary classes of India, but to which it is common, and certainly convenient, to give a wider meaning. . . .

On every side we may see that differences arise, and that these tend to be perpetuated through inherited associations, opportunities, and culture. . . . Unlikeness in the constituents, a settled system and a low state of communication and enlightenment favor the growth of caste, and *vice versa*. The first provides natural lines of cleavage and so makes it easier to split into hereditary groups; the second gives inheritance time to consolidate its power, while the third means the absence of those conscious and rational forces which are its chief rivals.⁸

Charles Page's study of the treatment of class by the American "Fathers" shows a similar general conception underlying the views of Small, Ross, and even Sumner.⁹

Of the contemporary students of stratification, we may mention R. H. Tawney, C. C. North, Wiese-Becker, Sorokin, Gerth and Mills, R. M. Williams, Jr., MacIver and Page, Harold Pfautz, and Kurt Mayer as a few of those (some, like Williams, with a functional orientation) who describe stratification as implying stratum permanence and hereditary inequality and not merely "achieved inequality."¹⁰ Thus, North has argued:

It is frequently urged that this emergence of the class of those who control modern economic processes through the ownership of capital is not a case of privilege but of a natural evolution, whereby those whose abilities are adapted to the creation of capital and to the occupation of management and control naturally find their places in this position of power. In order to substantiate such a view it would have to be shown that the creation of capital was the work of such individuals and that they entered their vocations through a process of competitive adaptation. As a matter of fact all historical evidence points in exactly the opposite direction. . . .

Private property and the family, conservative government, legalization of class, occu-

pational and religious differences, primogeniture, peonage, an aristocratic educational system, these are some of the socially created factors that tend to fasten upon the coming generations distinctions that have once become prevalent. In so far as these factors operate there are given to the members of the newer generations their respective places in the social system without reference to their own inherent qualities. But there is always the pretense that the inherent worth of the individual is the determining factor.¹¹

For MacIver and Page,

A *system* or *structure* of social classes involves, first, a hierarchy of status groups, second, the recognition of the superior-inferior stratification, and finally, some degree of permanency of the structure.¹²

And Mayer has recently stated:

Permanence is an important characteristic of social stratification. Rank hierarchies, like everything human, are changeable, but they tend to be relatively stable and enduring. Only those positions, therefore, which permit the exercise of power based on durable criteria, such as the possession of valuable material goods or the control of non-material values like magic formulas or religious symbols, can become the bases of permanent social strata.¹³

In our judgment Davis and Moore have in effect disclaimed any interest in the problem of stratification *per se* by claiming to concern themselves only with the system of positions of a society. As if attempting to justify their avoidance of what has been the central conception of stratification, they state emphatically:

Throughout, it will be necessary to keep in mind one thing—namely, that the discussion relates to the system of positions, not to the individuals occupying those positions. It is one thing to ask why different positions carry different degrees of prestige, and quite another to ask how certain individuals get into those positions. Although . . . both questions are related, it is essential to keep them separate in our thinking. . . . The first question . . . is logically prior and, in the case of any particular individual or group, factually prior.¹⁴

Leaving aside the debatable assertion of priority, it should be noted that concern for the

⁸ Charles H. Cooley, *Social Organization*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956, pp. 211, 217.

⁹ Charles Hunt Page, *Class and American Sociology*, New York: The Dial Press, 1940.

¹⁰ R. H. Tawney, *Equality*, London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 4th ed., 1952; Wiese-Becker, *op. cit.*; Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Social Mobility*, New York: Harper and Bros., 1927; Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, *Character and Social Structure*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953; Robin M. Williams, Jr., *American Society*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955, p. 89; Harold Pfautz, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

¹¹ Cecil C. North, *op. cit.*, pp. 222, 265.

¹² R. M. MacIver and Charles H. Page, *Society: An Introductory Analysis*, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1949, pp. 348-349.

¹³ Kurt B. Mayer, *Class and Society*, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955, p. 5.

¹⁴ Davis and Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

system of positions alone would have to stop with an analysis of their possible relations to and consequences for the system as a whole. When Davis and Moore go on, however, to speculate about processes motivating actors to fill these positions, and the relation between the superior capacities or the training of actors and the highly rewarded positions they must fill, then Davis and Moore must relinquish their claim since they are clearly concerning themselves with characteristics of individuals and how these aid such persons in attaining certain positions. Whereas we concur in the view that differentiation of position on the one hand and the problem of individual attainment of those positions on the other are analytically distinct concerns, we are arguing that, not only must the distinction be consistently maintained, but, even more important, we cannot entertain a theory of stratification unless it focuses directly on the latter concern.

If we can agree that the term "social strata" refers to social groups or collectivities, and not positions, and that stratification refers to the existence of strata in a society, then perhaps we should, logically, insist that stratification be defined in terms of groups or collectivities, not positions. It might help to avoid confusion if we resist the current tendency to say, "Social stratification refers to the existence of a graded hierarchy of social positions" and to declare, instead, "Social stratification refers to the existence of a graded hierarchy of continuous social groups or collectivities." The difference of emphasis here can be crucial, since the distinction between hierarchy of positions and hierarchy of groups opens up important questions. For example: To what extent, and how, does the former determine the latter, and vice versa? Would the range and particular structure of differential rewards and perquisites attaching to positions be what they are if it were not for the differential distribution of wealth, prestige, and power attaching to groups?

Failure to make and maintain the distinction between differentiation and stratification is brought out even more clearly in the recent volume by Bernard Barber, who builds the former concept into his definition of the latter. For Barber, stratification is "the product of the interaction of social differentiation

and social evaluation."¹⁵ It is "the result of the evaluations made of functionally important and differentiated social roles."¹⁶ Thus, "a system of stratification can be seen as a system of facilities, rewards, and punishments allocated to the members of a society for the ways in which they perform its functionally essential and valued roles."¹⁷ It follows then that "Position in the system of stratification is determined on the whole by performance in functionally essential roles. . . ."¹⁸ And further, Barber concludes that stratification is inevitable because, first, some differentiation is essential in any society—it would be too wasteful to train all men for every specialized role, even if all were capable; and, second, differential evaluation of roles cannot be eliminated—not all roles are equally important. In sum, since Barber has defined stratification in terms of differentiation, and since we can all generally agree that some social differentiation is essential, if not inevitable, then it logically follows that "Some system of stratification is a functional requirement of societies."¹⁹

But Barber fails to include the central notion of strata in his definition of stratification and thus, like Davis and Moore, ignores the distinction between stratification and differentiation. This distinction may perhaps be brought out more clearly by the consideration that a non-stratified society (if the functionalist can, for the moment, grant such a possibility) containing no intergenerationally continuous strata: (1) would nevertheless be differentiated in terms of duties, rights, and perquisites, (2) might, without being inconsistent, recognize differential evaluation of roles (though not necessarily of persons), and (3) would still have the problem of training and selecting the new members for the various roles. The classlessness of the society would have nothing directly to do with its differentiation but would be manifested in the fact that a person's initial social position or milieu at birth would not be correlated

¹⁵ Bernard Barber, *Social Stratification*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1957, p. 2.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

with his adult social position, except perhaps to the very small extent that current fact and theory allow us to correlate validly the individual's biologically based capacities or talents with his biological background. Stratified societies, on the other hand, have been viewed historically (as we have noted above) in terms of just such a correlation between individuals' initial social positions at birth and their adult social positions, giving rise to castes, estates, or classes. This is why the several recent empirical studies of *intergenerational* mobility, as distinct from career patterns *per se*, are crucial in establishing the fact and the extent of stratification.

The manner in which the functionalists present the stratification system as actually operating is rather the way in which many persons desire and believe that it would work in contemporary society if only the class structure did not exist to hinder it! As Mayer states,

According to democratic ideology a person's social position should depend solely upon his own qualities and achievements and he should be free to rise above or fall below his parents' class and status groups in accordance with his personal capacities. Correspondingly, social classes should consist merely of temporary aggregates of individuals who happen to have achieved similar social positions at any particular time.²⁰

Thus, it is precisely the issue of equality or inequality of initial opportunity to acquire the qualifications socially defined as necessary for achievement of functionally important positions that is conspicuously absent from the functionalists' theory.

The fact that differentiation and stratification are analytically distinct does not imply that they are not closely interrelated. Social differentiation accompanied by great inequalities in the distribution of wealth, power, and prestige, can be seen to promote the development of more or less permanent strata; these, in turn, seem to promote the maintenance of large inequalities. Put otherwise, a classless society that nevertheless maintained great inequalities would seem to be as sociologically improbable as a stratified society maintaining no significant inequalities. Anthropological studies suggest, however, at the preliterate level at least, that such

types of societies have existed. An important case in point is the Kwakiutl society of rank without class. Here is a society, according to a recent analysis,²¹ with a proliferation of differentiated ranks and titles, but with each passed on from individual to individual, such that during his lifetime a person may be anything from a chief to a commoner. The result is that no classes can develop since no subgroup maintains a stable status over a long enough period for material, psychological, or subcultural distinctions to develop and persist.

Support for our basic argument is provided by the difficulties faced by the functionalist in attempting to square his theoretical formulation with research evidence. Thus, Barber, in discussing ethnic, racial, and religious criteria of stratification, drops his theoretical guard by suggesting that "There is *no necessary* reason why a member of a society born into any given ethnic, racial, or religious group in that society cannot learn to perform adequately in any social role that society includes, whether high-ranking or low-ranking."²² If we extend this formulation to include any economic or social group in general, and no reason is given why we may not, we arrive at the proposition that stratification is not necessary, or inevitable, after all. For an explanation of its ubiquity, then, we must turn, not to any functional necessity, but to the sociocultural dynamics of particular times and places.

A second difficulty is involved in Barber's claim that "Position in the system of stratification is determined on the whole by performance in functionally essential roles. . . ." Although Barber dedicates his book to Robert Merton he apparently overlooks a telling point made by his mentor. After pointing out the great difficulties involved in trying to establish a "clear minimum inventory of 'functional needs' of social systems," Merton writes:

Much the same can be said of the formally described need for motivating people to perform "the essential social roles" in a society. The criteria of the "essential" are of course heavily dependent on the social system as it

²¹ Cf. Helen Codere, "Kwakiutl Society: Rank without Class," *American Anthropologist*, 59 (June, 1957), pp. 473-486.

²² Barber, *op. cit.*, p. 60 (emphasis in original).

²⁰ Mayer, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

exists at a given time. In actual practice, functional sociologists devote little attention to alternative roles "essential" to the modification of a social system in determinate directions.²³

Furthermore, the empirical data Barber gathers together in later chapters show overwhelmingly that, even in modern democratic societies, the social positions of the majority of adults are at the same or very similar levels in the hierarchy as those of their parents. In other words, positions are determined on the whole by social inheritance, and only secondarily, *within this pattern*, by "performance." Although "performance" by itself may be important, it is the *chance to perform* that is at stake here.

Barber himself reaches this conclusion, although he fails to make explicit its implications for his functional theory: "... it happens that every child is born into the social class of his parents, is socialized accordingly, and derives greater or fewer advantages or disadvantages from his initial class position. . . . The family restricts equality of opportunity."²⁴ Barber seems to be trying to have and eat his cake. On the one hand, he states that position in a system of stratification is determined primarily by performance in functionally important roles. On the other hand, he declares that in no society can this be the case because it is inevitable that the family plays a central (according to his own interpretation, *the* central) role in determining position in the system; any other arrangement, he claims, would destroy the family (another confused but widely held hypothesis that we cannot discuss here).²⁵

We note further that Barber's theory holds that social stratification is integrative for society "to the extent that it expresses a common and shared set of values."²⁶ But the empirical materials he uses show, in his own words, how

Family solidarity will cause the members of different classes to have different interests in

social mobility . . . different political interests . . . different attitudes toward income- and inheritance-tax laws . . . obviously, have different economic interests . . . different educational interests. . . . And so it will be with every other kind of social interest—recreational, 'cultural,' and even religious.²⁷

Barber's conclusion from all this, however, is: "Thus the upper and the lower classes will have opposed interests *because* they share a fundamental value consensus."²⁸ Unless we have missed a subtle point here, we believe that a more warranted conclusion is that stratification, in principle as well as in practice, is incompatible with value consensus on any level.²⁹

Finally, Barber's theoretical orientation and conceptual commitment lead him to see a direct correlation between functional differentiation and inequality:

When we examine the evidence from many different societies, we discover a positive correlation between the amount of role differentiation and the development of a system of stratification. . . . Modern industrial societies, of course, are so highly differentiated that they all have elaborate systems of stratification. . . .³⁰

But, we must ask, in what sense do modern societies have more highly developed and

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 256–257.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 257 (emphasis in original).

²⁹ Most students of society with a strong historical sense should find little difficulty in supporting the view that stratification has been, on balance, an actual or potential disruptive force. The fact that highly stratified societies like India have survived for many centuries proves, not that stratification is integrative as some claim, but only that a high degree of stratification can persist and the society "survive" at a certain level under such conditions as autocracy, little functional differentiation, and a low state of communication and enlightenment.

The question of whether functional differentiation *per se* is also, on balance, disintegrative is complicated by the difficulty of separating out the effects of stratification that, in practice, are closely intermingled with differentiation. Thus, it would seem that functional specialization, while leading to differences in *some* spheres of activity and outlook, need not lead to gross cleavages of a subcultural character such as stratification promotes. We might well subscribe to the perspective of C. C. North who, accepting Durkheim's argument that increasing division of labor leads to organic solidarity of cohesive interdependence, notes also the disruptive potential of overspecialization and of individualistically oriented interest groups. North, *op. cit.*, Part IV.

³⁰ Barber, *op. cit.*, pp. 14–15.

²³ Robert K. Merton, "Discussion," *American Sociological Review*, 13 (April, 1948), p. 168.

²⁴ Barber, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

²⁵ Cf. Codere, *op. cit.*, for evidence that wide differences of rank could and did typically exist with the Kwakiutl family with no particular stress noted.

²⁶ Barber, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

elaborated systems of stratification than, for example, India, Classical China, or feudal Europe? Do we not hold up such societies to students as models of highly elaborate stratified systems? Thus R. H. Tawney writes:

A community which is marked by a low degree of economic differentiation may yet possess a class system of which the lines are sharply drawn and rigidly defined, as was the case, for example, in many parts of the agricultural Europe of the eighteenth century. It may be marked by a high degree of economic differentiation, and yet appear, when judged by English standards, to be comparatively classless, as is the case, for example, with some British Dominions.³¹

In sum, it would not seem unjust to say that the functionalists' ³² unique definition

³¹ Tawney, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53.

³² Merton's view that the functional approach does not logically entail the difficulties discussed above is without doubt sound. (See R. K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949, Chapter 1.) Yet the frequent stress of functionalism on the "survival of society" easily leads one to look very hard for, or find very easily, some existing structural arrangement which, under the guise of explaining the

of stratification jetisons much of the previous work done in this area and promotes an insuperable discontinuity in sociological research.³³

survival of "society" (a very difficult concept to specify apart from the *status quo*), succeeds only in justifying the persistence of some existing structure, e.g., a class system. When we work in the other direction, however, starting with existing structures and seek their consequences for or determine relationships to the total system in the present or future (a non-functionalist orientation), we are more easily humbled before the enormity of the task.

In any case, the student of sociology of knowledge might well argue that when we add to the logical structure of functionalism the factors of "human nature" and ethnocentrism, the probability is very great that some misuse will occur. Past experience would lend this some support. Cf. the writer's "Structural-Functional Analysis in Modern Sociology," in Howard Becker and Alvin Boskoff (editors), *Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*, New York: The Dryden Press, 1957, Chapter 8.

³³ A similar conclusion is reached by Jean Floud in her trenchant criticism of Theodore Geiger's functional orientation and concomitant confusion of social differentiation with social stratification. See "Social Stratification in Denmark" (Review Article), *British Journal of Sociology*, 3 (June, 1952), especially pp. 176-177.

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS AND POLITICAL SOLIDARITY

OSCAR GLANTZ

Michigan State University

Is a class a class because "thinking makes it so," or is a class a class purely on objective grounds? If the first view is correct, it must be extended logically to include the proposition that class consciousness is necessarily antecedent to the existence of classes,¹ and this proposition in turn carries

¹ It would be discursive in the current paper to examine the literature on this problem, but it might be noted that the subjective approach has been dominant in recent decades. For an early example, see R. M. MacIver, *Society*, New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1937. MacIver suggests that "the concept of class loses its sociological significance if it is defined by any purely objective criterion, such as . . . occupational function." Moreover, he argues that "unless class consciousness is present, then no matter what criterion we take, we have not a social class but a mere logical category or type." (p. 167)

with it the notion that an individual's subjective self-placement is the determinant of his class position. Thus, sociologists who hold this view may entertain such images as "business class" assembly-line workers and "laboring class" corporation executives, both of which are encountered in field surveys which depend upon a subjective conceptualization of classes.²

² For example, Richard Centers, *The Psychology of Social Classes*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951. Among the blue-collar workers in his sample, 21 per cent claimed membership in the upper or middle class, while 23 per cent of his business, professional and white-collar respondents claimed membership in the working class. To account for these claims, he referred to them in the following way: "The manual workers identifying themselves with the middle class are thus a *minority group*,

To the writer, the subjective approach is a form of solipsism in which objective conditions are either neglected or negated.³ The view here is that the existence of an objective class is one of the prior conditions to class consciousness. Accordingly, a class is not the product of its consciousness, but develops into a self-conscious class when its members become aware of their objective conditions. From this viewpoint, when an assembly-line worker, say, claims allegiance to the business class, he is not therefore a member of that class. Such claims may have their place in social reality, but we would do well to view them as examples of false consciousness. Following Durkheim, an individual can never recruit himself into a class by psychological invention.⁴

This is not to say that the study of class consciousness should attach any significance to self-identifications which are consistent with objective position, particularly if such identifications are responses to a forced-choice question.⁵ If class consciousness is supposed to mean more than a simple awareness of economic position, one should expect this awareness to be accompanied by class-related politico-economic values.⁶ Indeed, it would appear that class consciousness can emerge only when an individual is aware of his politico-economic interests, and in such a way that he recognizes his unity with others and the general nature of class opposition.⁷

in a sense, within it. Likewise, . . . businessmen, professional people, and white collar workers . . . constitute a *minority* within the working class." (p. 125, emphasis added.)

³ This is not to say that the subjective approach does not have heuristic value in some types of research, e.g., in studies of vertical mobility.

⁴ Emile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method* (translated by S. A. Solovay and J. H. Mueller), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

⁵ For a demonstration of the inadequacies of forced-choice questions on class identification, see Neal Gross, "Social Class Identification in the Urban Community," *American Sociological Review*, 18 (August, 1953), pp. 398-404.

⁶ On this point, see Llewellyn Gross, "The Use of Class Concepts in Sociological Research," *American Journal of Sociology*, 54 (January, 1949), pp. 409-421; and H. J. Eysenck, "Social Attitude and Social Class," *The British Journal of Sociology*, 1 (March, 1950), pp. 56-66.

⁷ Along this line, we would suggest that any "loss" of awareness can affect the dynamics of class relations but not the existence of objective classes.

Class consciousness, so construed, can be observed when an individual responds to appropriate politico-economic situations, stories, or statements by accepting the values of his own class and rejecting the values of an antagonistic class,⁸ particularly if he claims initially (even in reply to a forced-choice question) that he owes his allegiance to his occupational fellows. In the research reported in this paper, an approach of this sort was used.

In addition to the related problems of the meaning and measurement of class consciousness, there is the question of whether "class conscious" individuals in a given in-group are motivated similarly in responding to political events. More specifically, *does class consciousness lead to political cohesiveness at the ballot box, not only in party preference but also in the motivational basis for that preference?* This is the question to which this paper is addressed.

The importance of this question derives from a well-known theory of political behavior. If common action can serve as a mechanism of social change when it challenges the social system, or as a mechanism of social rigidity when it defends the system, we ought to know whether there is a firm relationship between common action and class consciousness. In the event that an accumulation of empirical evidence indicates that such consciousness does not lead inevitably to cohesiveness in political behavior, we should re-examine the theoretical problem of the dynamic elements in mass society.

PROCEDURE

This paper is part of a larger study of political behavior and motivation in Philadelphia.⁹ To collect the necessary data, 400

⁸ For an excellent example of a study which utilized stories to detect attitudes toward corporate property, see Alfred W. Jones, *Life, Liberty and Property*, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1941. Jones was not concerned explicitly with class consciousness, but he measured an aspect of it by asking respondents in Akron whether they approved or disapproved of the action portrayed in a series of non-fictional stories which had one feature in common, namely "that each of them describes a struggle or antagonism in which one of the sides is working to protect the interests of corporate property. . . ." (p. 21)

⁹ For a report on a different aspect of the study,

white males of Protestant (201) or Catholic (199) background, selected in a disproportionately stratified sample from 14 precincts throughout the city, were interviewed in their homes during the winter of 1952-1953.¹⁰ Of the 400, 388 were classified as follows: 43 big businessmen, 63 professionals, 65 small businessmen, 61 salesmen and clerical workers, 74 skilled craftsmen, and 82 semi-skilled and service workers.¹¹ Of the 156 workers in the latter two groups, 93 were union members in various AFL, CIO or independent locals, 62 were non-unionists, and one could not be classified. With the exception of the big business stratum, in which Catholics were somewhat under-represented, there was at least a 60-40 distribution of Protestants and Catholics, or Catholics and

Protestants, in all strata and in the union and non-union divisions. More than 90 per cent of the informants in each group were native-born.

To sharpen the focus of this report, it was decided to concentrate on the responses of four groups: big and small businessmen, and union and non-union workers. Moreover, the big business and union groups receive primary attention in the analysis.

"Class conscious" persons were designated on the basis of a combination of "allegiance" and "orientation." The question on allegiance, administered as part of the interview-schedule, read: "To which one of these groups do you feel you owe your allegiance—business or labor?" Some respondents, of course, claimed allegiance to both groups, others to neither group, and a few stated that they did not know. Answers such as "both," "neither," and "don't know" are treated alike as middle-of-the-road responses.

In a separate questionnaire, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with six partisan statements culled from the literature of two organizations of opposite politico-economic viewpoints—three from the National Association of Manufacturers and three from the Congress of Industrial Organizations,¹² which were unidentified in the questionnaire. Interviewees were not required to agree or disagree if they found it impossible to do so, but could indicate that they were undecided or uninformed on any given issue. The following statements were used:

Industry-wide bargaining in the coal industry has fostered one of the strongest [union] monopolies . . . ever experienced.¹³

Federal ownership and operation of electric power facilities . . . [is] the spearhead of our advance into socialism.¹⁴

¹² The statements were selected after a search through business and labor literature had produced an abundance of suitable items. The writer judged these items as to their relative importance, intelligibility, and incisiveness. Some attempt was also made to balance the quality of formulation on each side, but this task was complicated by the fact that the literature was originally addressed to different audiences.

¹³ National Association of Manufacturers, Economic Policy Division Series, *The Economic Impact of an Industry-wide Strike*, No. 27 (July, 1950), p. 1.

¹⁴ NAM, Economic Policy Division Series, *Cut Non-defense Spending Now*, No. 40 (February, 1951), p. 10.

see Oscar Glantz, "Unitary Political Behavior and Differential Political Motivation," *Western Political Quarterly*, 10 (December, 1957), pp. 833-846.

¹⁰ As a stratified sample, a set of seven predominantly Protestant precincts, each somewhat different in occupational composition, and a set of seven predominantly Catholic precincts, similarly marked by occupational diversity, were selected on the basis of census tract data on occupational distributions in various neighborhoods, information in a directory of churches, and political maps. Each set was supposed to yield 210 males evenly distributed in seven occupational groups, but the final sample was inadequate in one cell (14 Catholics in the big business stratum) and far below a usable number in two cells (4 unskilled Protestants and 8 unskilled Catholics). The selection of precincts was followed by the preparation of lists of households so that 14 sub-samples could be drawn on a random basis. The sample proportions varied in size, with the smallest including every sixteenth household in one of the larger precincts and every twelfth household in another, and the largest including every sixth household in one of the smaller precincts. Every eighth unit was selected in seven precincts, and every tenth in four others. With some allowance for refusals and households without adult males, the total sample was designed to yield 420 interviews, preferably with the male head of the house. As it happened, the male head of the house was obtained in 387 of the 400 completed cases, the remaining interviews taking place with sons, one father-in-law, and one boarder. The refusal rate was lower than expected (10 per cent) but the number of households without adult males was larger than expected, particularly in two precincts selected as upper occupational areas. In addition, a small number of dwellings were lost because they were vacant, the family was on vacation, or were occupied by persons who were neither Protestant nor Catholic.

¹¹ For a detailed examination of the types of occupations included within each stratum, see Glantz, *op. cit.*, Table 1, p. 835.

The demand for an excess profits tax is always based on emotional and political considerations. . . .¹⁵

If your senators or your congressmen voted to end rent control, they voted to take money out of your pocket.¹⁶

A national health insurance program to provide . . . medical care for all the people [should be enacted by Congress].¹⁷

The Taft-Hartley law is a legalized attack on the basic human rights of wage earners. . . .¹⁸

To gain some notion of the extent to which informants in the various groups were consistently oriented in responding to the total set of items, a technique for organizing qualitative data on an essentially qualitative basis was used. Agreement with the NAM or disagreement with the CIO was scored as a *business-oriented* response, while disagreement with the NAM or agreement with the CIO was scored as a *labor-oriented* response. In the case of indecision (or "don't know"), the answer was scored as an *indeterminate* response. Interviewees who gave at least three more business-oriented than labor-oriented responses to the six statements were classified as consistently business-oriented; those who gave at least three more labor-oriented than business-oriented responses were listed as consistently labor-oriented. All other combinations of responses were categorized as inconsistent or indeterminate combinations.¹⁹

¹⁵ NAM, Economic Policy Division Series, *A Federal Tax Program for the Period of Defense and Partial Mobilization*, No. 34 (October, 1950), p. 15.

¹⁶ Congress of Industrial Organizations, Political Action Committee, *How To Cut Your Rent* (1952), p. 2.

¹⁷ CIO, Political Action Committee, *The Platforms: Here's How They Stack Up* (1952), no pagination.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ That the six statements belong together as a meaningful matrix was established by an item-analysis test in which the phi coefficient was utilized as a measure of the correlation between each item and total score for persons in top-score versus bottom-score criterion groups, each containing 27 per cent of the sample. To obtain the criterion groups, a total score for each person in the sample was developed by assigning 3, 2 and 1 points, respectively, for business-oriented, indeterminate and labor-oriented responses to eight statements in the original set. Inasmuch as the phi coefficient measures the correlation of a fourfold distribution, dichotomous classifications are necessary. In the case at hand, the computations for each item were in terms of agree-disagree dichotomies in which inde-

Table 1 shows that a majority of persons in three of the four occupational groups were marked off as inconsistently-oriented persons. The business-oriented and labor-oriented categories could have been inflated considerably by including combinations in which there was a preponderance of two responses of a given type over its opposite, thereby deflating the large percentages of inconsistently-oriented persons. But such a procedure clearly would invalidate the idea of consistency and might impair the meaning of the several categories.²⁰

On the assumption that the six NAM and CIO statements were appropriate representations of business and labor values at the time of the interviews, consistent orientation was taken as a sign of contemporary "class consciousness" when it accompanied in-group allegiance. In these terms, loyal business-oriented businessmen and loyal labor-oriented workers were designated as "class conscious" persons.

There is no suggestion here, however, that such "consciousness" on the part of a wage worker carries with it a Marxian determination to smash the wage system. A latent tendency toward radicalism undoubtedly exists among some workers, but there is little or no historical evidence to indicate that it has recently been developing into a conscious ideology.²¹ The more realistic view is that American workers, in the main, have not been receptive to political or economic radicalism. This situation may be, in part, the consequence of the non-militancy of labor leaders, but it probably also reflects

terminate responses were divided proportionately. The coefficients for the six items retained in the politico-economic battery are located within a range from .54 to .79, while both of the excluded statements had coefficients of .37. For a discussion of this method, see, e.g., P. H. Kriedt and K. E. Clark, "Item Analysis Versus 'Scale Analysis,'" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 33 (April, 1949), pp. 114-121.

²⁰ For a study involving six items from which conservative and radical categories were established by including combinations in which there was a lead of two responses of a given type over its opposite, see Centers, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-41.

²¹ On this point, an interesting methodologically derived fiction is presented by Centers, *op. cit.*, Table 8, p. 57. As a result of the criterion discussed in footnote 20, no less than 50 per cent of the semi-skilled workers in a national sample were labeled "radicals" or "ultra-radicals."

the seductive combination of mass consumer goods, mass advertising, and mass credit.

Nonetheless, spokesmen for organized business and labor engage continuously in a conflict which reflects immediate politico-economic interests, illustrated by the literature of the NAM and CIO at the time of this study. The NAM and CIO did not represent all of business and labor in the winter of 1952-53, of course, but both were prominent in the on-going contest between the two factions.²²

"CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS"

Distribution of business-labor orientations.

The data show, in the first place, that there was less out-group antipathy on the part of union members in responding negatively to individual NAM statements than there was on the part of big businessmen in so responding to individual CIO statements.²³ In addition, unionists were more indecisive in responding to the total set of items. For example, approximately one-fourth of the union members expressed neither a positive or negative position on two prominent issues, the excess profits tax and the Taft-Hartley law. Thus the percentage of consistently labor-oriented unionists was substantially below the percentage of consistently business-oriented businessmen (Table 1). Whereas almost two-thirds of the big businessmen were definitely business-directed, less than half of the union members were labor-directed.²⁴

²² On the leadership of the NAM, see, e.g., Robert A. Brady, *Business as a System of Power*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1943, p. 191 *et passim*; and Alfred S. Cleveland, "NAM: Spokesman for Industry?" *Harvard Business Review*, 26 (May, 1948), pp. 353-371. On the CIO, it should be noted that by 1952 the eventual AFL-CIO merger was already visible in various parts of the country, including Philadelphia. For example, Labor's League for Political Education (AFL) and the Political Action Committee (CIO) cooperated extensively in the presidential campaign that year.

²³ On the other hand, it should be noted that there was as much in-group solidarity on the part of unionists in responding affirmatively to CIO statements as there was on the part of big businessmen in responding affirmatively to NAM statements.

²⁴ The writer has suggested elsewhere that some persons may have reduced the consistency of their total response by rejecting the emotionalism inherent in partisan statements with which they might have otherwise agreed. "An Appraisal of Protestant-Catholic Differences in Voting Behavior," *Public Opinion Quarterly* (submitted).

TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF BUSINESS-LABOR ORIENTATIONS

	N	% Business- oriented	% Labor- oriented	% In- deter- minate
Big businessmen (43)		63	2	35
Small businessmen (65)		35	5	60
Non-union workers (62)		13	22	65
Union workers (93)		4	43	53

Notwithstanding union newspapers, pamphlets, meetings and resolutions, it appears that unionism in Philadelphia had not been especially effective as an in-group educational agency.

At the same time, the influence of unionism (or other factors) was apparently sufficient to counteract the development of consistent pro-business attitudes. Although many union members revealed indeterminate or wavering attitudes toward the selected values of business and labor, only four per cent expressed attitudes which were definitely incongruous with their objective occupational class.

Allegiance and Orientation. The immediate question here is the extent to which in-group allegiance is accompanied by in-group orientation. But the basic problem is to determine whether "class consciousness," defined as integrated allegiance-and-orientation, can be viewed as an intervening variable which leads to political cohesiveness.

Table 2 shows that business-allegiance was accompanied by business-orientation in about three-fourths (77 per cent) of 22 big business cases and in half of 32 small business cases, thereby indicating that 40 per cent of all big businessmen in the sample (17/43) and 25 per cent of all small businessmen (16/65) were "class conscious." The 40 per cent figure for big businessmen, however, may be an under-assessment. The percentage of big business persons who were actually business-oriented (63 per cent) was higher than the percentage of those who claimed allegiance to business (51 per cent). By disclaiming (perhaps self-consciously) singular allegiance to the group toward which they were clearly

TABLE 2. BUSINESS-LABOR ORIENTATIONS, BY ALLEGIANCE GROUPS

	N	% Business-oriented	% Labor-oriented	% Indeterminate
Business				
Allegiance *				
Big businessmen (22)	77	0	23	
Small businessmen (32)	50	3	47	
Middle-of-the-road				
Big businessmen (19)	47	0	53	
Small businessmen (23)	26	4	70	
Non-union workers (22)	18	23	59	
Union workers (29)	7	38	55	
Labor				
Allegiance **				
Non-union workers (27)	7	30	63	
Union workers (52)	2	50	48	

* Among workers who claimed allegiance to business, business-orientation was limited to two of 13 non-unionists and one of 12 unionists. There were ten indeterminates in the former group and eight in the latter.

** Of two big businessmen who claimed allegiance to labor, one was labor-oriented, the other business-oriented. Labor-orientation among ten small businessmen who claimed allegiance to labor was limited to one person, while eight were in the indeterminate category.

oriented, some big businessmen did not meet the requirements for "class consciousness" used in this study. Nonetheless, "class consciousness" was found most markedly in the big business unit.

For wage workers, labor-allegiance was accompanied by labor-orientation in 50 per cent of 52 union cases and 30 per cent of 27 non-union cases, indicating that 28 per cent of all unionists (26/93) and 13 per cent of all non-unionists (8/62) were "class conscious." The 28 per cent figure for the union group is consistent with the findings of other recent studies, not of class consciousness as such, but of attitudes which seem to reflect a strong working-class predis-

position. In a study of UAW members (auto workers), for example, 26 per cent were found to be "very strongly" pro-labor.²⁵ An investigation of IAM members (machinists) reports that 22 per cent agreed that the union "should tell members whom to vote for."²⁶ And in a study of unionists in a large local of steelworkers, 25 per cent of the active members stated without qualification that slowdowns are justified.²⁷ If these figures are representative, they suggest that roughly 20 to 30 per cent of the rank-and-file are militants, the hard core of the union movement.²⁸

POLITICAL COHESIVENESS

Party Preference. Additional questions in the interview-schedule requested information on whether or how the interviewee had voted in the Truman-Dewey election of 1948 and the Eisenhower-Stevenson election of 1952. A final question on the 1952 election was phrased as follows: "May I ask you why you voted for your candidate?—Your most important reason or reasons?"

When big businessmen are divided between "class conscious" individuals and others, the voting data show, for the former, a solid "class" vote in both elections, as well as very large majorities for the Republican candidates for other big businessmen. Thus:²⁹

	Percentage Republican:	1948	1952
"Class conscious"			
big businessmen	(16)	100	(16) 100
Other big businessmen	(23)	78	(23) 87

²⁵ A. Kornhauser, H. L. Sheppard, and A. J. Mayer, *When Labor Votes*, New York: University Books, 1956, p. 117.

²⁶ Hjalmar Rosen and R. A. Rosen, *The Union Member Speaks*, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955, p. 37.

²⁷ R. S. Hammett, J. Seidman and J. London, "The Slowdown as a Union Tactic," *Journal of Political Economy*, 65 (April, 1957), p. 131.

²⁸ However, note the view of Seymour M. Lipset and Reinhard Bendix that militancy varies considerably from one group of workers to another, depending on the type of work, their relative isolation in society, and other factors in their working environment. *Social Status and Social Structure: A Re-examination of Data and Interpretations*, Berkeley: Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Reprint No. 35, 1952, pp. 243-244. This paper is an excellent analysis of theoretical and methodological problems in stratification research.

²⁹ N's exclude non-voters.

When unionists are similarly divided, the data show that the "class conscious" segment voted overwhelmingly for Truman in 1948 (91 per cent) and Stevenson in 1952 (86 per cent). Other unionists displayed less solidarity in voting, particularly in 1952, but the probable influence of unionism is still apparent in their 64 per cent vote for Stevenson. This is strongly suggested when the Democratic vote among non-unionists is examined. Thus:²⁹

Percentage Democratic:	1948	1952
"Class conscious"		
union workers	(22) 91	(21) 86
Other union workers	(59) 75	(56) 64
All non-union workers	(49) 59	(48) 35

Although the foregoing data indicate that "class consciousness" is associated with voting behavior, they do not establish a causal nexus. The latter requires independent evidence that "class consciousness" is related causally to political action. Such evidence would be available, for example, if "class conscious" businessmen claimed that they voted Republican because they *believe* that "the Democrats pursue policies which are inimical to the prosperity of business," or if "class conscious" unionists claimed that they voted Democratic because they *believe* that they were "backing a labor party." In these terms, if "class consciousness" does in fact lead to solidarity in voting, one should expect a greater concentration of such motives in "class conscious" groups than among their occupational peers who voted the same way.

Motives. In answering the question about why they voted for a given candidate in 1952, Republican and Democratic voters made various positive and negative comments or both, concerning parties, issues, and personalities. Most of these comments were classified under general captions designed to convey the major motivational tendencies, while a small number were regarded as miscellany.³⁰ These captions (except a few, considered to be unimportant) are listed in Table 3 for Republicans and Table 4 for Democrats.

³⁰ For a detailed discussion of the procedure used to classify Republican motives, see Glantz, "Unitary Political Behavior . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 836-838.

TABLE 3. REASONS FOR VOTING REPUBLICAN IN 1952 *

	Big Businessmen	
	"Class Conscious"	Others
	(16) %	(20) %
Vs. policies and record of Dem. party (incl. assoc. of Dem. with -isms of the left)	56	20
Rep. principles and policies	25	15
Always Republican	44	25
Vs. corruption in government	19	25
Time for a change	13	45
To end Korean war; improve int'l situation	13	15
Eisenhower as a personality (organizer, leader, honest)	6	10

* Does not include miscellaneous reasons. Percentages total more than 100 because some respondents gave more than one major reason.

The data for big businessmen who voted Republican are more difficult to interpret than the data for wage workers who voted Democratic. Note in Table 3 that larger percentages of "class conscious" big businessmen, in comparison with other big businessmen claimed that it was a matter of perennial Republicanism, that they were committed to Republican principles and policies, and that they viewed the Democratic party in various unfavorable ways. These three reasons were offered by 88 per cent of the "class conscious" segment and 45 per cent of the others. Thus, the two groups differed to some extent in their approach to Republicanism, but the factors creating the difference were not always explicitly class-related. References to perennial Republicanism, unless associated with Republican business principles, can have several meanings. References to Republican principles, unless specifically associated with business principles, can leave the issue in doubt. Similarly, negative references to the Democratic party are difficult to evaluate in some cases.

This is not to say that all of the comments were difficult to interpret. Some comments, in fact, contained implicit class-related meanings. For example, one informant explained that he voted Republican "for the salvation of the country, to get us out of the clutches of the crazy Democratic economic pattern." Another put it this way: "I'm

TABLE 4. REASONS FOR VOTING DEMOCRATIC IN 1952 *

	Wage Workers	
	"Class Conscious"	
	Unionists (18) %	Others** (53) %
Dem. party and Stevenson assoc. with interests of labor	72	34
Vs. influence of Taft	11	15
Vs. policies and record of Rep. party (incl. assoc. of Rep. with depression)	11	11
Dem. party assoc. with pros- perity	11	32
Vs. military man as president	6	30
Stevenson as a personality (experienced, bright, like FDR)	22	23
Liberal principles of Dem. party	6	4

* Excludes miscellaneous reasons. Percentages total more than 100 because some respondents gave more than one major reason.

** Includes other unionists and all non-unionists.

bitterly opposed to the New Deal. I think it is un-American." In the writer's opinion, in these cases, "class consciousness" did in fact lead to political solidarity, not only in political preference but in the motivational basis for it as well.

A similar conclusion for wage workers who voted Democratic is drawn with much less hesitancy. Note in Table 4 that approximately three-fourths of the "class conscious" unionists, in comparison with one-third of the other wage workers, associated the Democratic party or Stevenson with the interests of labor. To illustrate the explicitly class-related nature of their remarks a composite quotation is presented below. It contains key comments of the 13 "class conscious" unionists who are included in the 72 per cent figure in Table 4. They voted Democratic for the following reason:

Labor. It comes down to labor. I was backing a labor party. Because the Democratic party is more for the working class. I felt the Democrats was more or less in favor of the working class—they proved this in the past twenty years with favorable laws. I got more under them than I did under anyone else—I got collective bargaining. Things were alright for labor under the Democratic party. Generally, I felt as though Stevenson had more sympathy for unions. Well, he was for the

labor man. For his pro-labor policy. To me, he seemed to be more for the working class of people. Because he's for the working party. He seemed to be in back of labor, which the Democrats have proven the years they've been in power.

DISCUSSION

A series of empirical observations have been presented based upon some in-group responses to partisan statements on politico-economic issues. Inasmuch as the statements must be regarded as mere fragments of business and labor "lines" at the time of the interviews, it is conceivable that a different set of items might have produced different results. In the current study, however, the leading observations can be summarized as follows:

(1) Unionists displayed less out-group antipathy than big businessmen in responding negatively to out-group statements.

(2) Consequently, the percentage of consistently labor-oriented persons in the ranks of organized labor (43 per cent) was substantially below the percentage of consistently business-oriented persons in the business elite (63 per cent).

(3) On the basis of integrated in-group allegiance and in-group orientation, 40 per cent of all big businessmen in the sample and 28 per cent of all union members were designated as "class conscious" persons.

(4) "Class consciousness" was related *empirically* to political solidarity in voting. "Class conscious" big businessmen gave a 100 per cent vote to Dewey and Eisenhower in 1948 and 1952 respectively, while "class conscious" unionists gave 91 per cent of their vote to Truman in 1948 and 86 per cent to Stevenson in 1952.

(5) Moreover, "class consciousness" was related *intrinsically* to solidarity in voting. Much more often than not, and more often than their occupational peers who voted the same way, "class conscious" persons had class-related motives for voting as they did.

It is not necessary to belabor the point that interest-group propaganda, when effective, is one of the conditions which can create class consciousness. But it is important here to recall that the characteristics of such propaganda tend to vary from one historical situation to another. At the time of the cur-

rent study, in a period of excellent business profits and full employment, in a period when social forces were more conducive to inter-group harmony than to inter-group conflict, the prevailing business and labor "lines" were characterized by immediate and limited politico-economic interests. The organizational literature of business and labor for the period under review shows that these interest groups were not engaged in an ideological conflict of durable consequences for long-range class dynamics. Thus, the research procedure was designed to discover the presence or absence of immediate and limited "class consciousness."

Within this limited historical context, the findings suggest that the big business men were much more alert than the unionists to the advantages of a common politico-economic front. This disparity was primarily a function of differential out-group hostility. Readiness to stand in opposition may be typical of dominant groups in periods of relative quiescence.

On the other hand, "class conscious" per-

sons in both groups seemed to be equally alert to the advantages of common political action. To be sure, "the numerical strength of the business and industrial community . . . is such that complete group solidarity at the polls is of little significance."³¹ But solidarity obviously would augment the power of the elite to manipulate the political situation. It would provide, for example, additional opportunities to "sell" their program to the general community. In contrast, if working class consciousness were highly developed, the numerical strength of that class could have direct influence on the political situation.

One final remark concerns a problem which was not treated in this study but should be examined in the future. Why were some unionists "class conscious" while others were not? An approach to this problem designed to measure diverse aspects of the individual's class-related experiences might turn up an index of some predictive value.

³¹ Cleveland, *op. cit.*, p. 354.

COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURES AND PARTISANSHIP

ROBERT E. AGGER AND DANIEL GOLDRICH *

University of North Carolina

A COMPARATIVE community study of local politics in two communities in the Far West in 1953-1954 affords an opportunity to examine the nature of, and relationships between, the political parties in the community, the informal Republican organization of Main Street, and the local power structure. None of the recently reported community power structure studies has focussed upon the question of whether there may be important relationships be-

tween the local power structure and partisan behavior.¹

Local elections are legally non-partisan in Valley City, a small retail trading center of about 2,000 adults, as well as in Boomtown, a rapidly growing industrial community of about 16,000 population. In each community self-identified Democrats out-

* Revised version of paper read at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September, 1957. We wish to thank Vincent Ostrom and John M. Fosskett of the University of Oregon for the data upon which this analysis is based. The Urban Studies Committee of the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina and the Social Science Research Council provided financial assistance during the tabulation and analysis phases.

¹ See Robert O. Schulze and Leonard U. Blumberg, "The Determination of Power Elites," *American Journal of Sociology*, 63 (November, 1957), pp. 290-96 and the references cited in notes 4, 5 and 6 of this article. See also Robert O. Schulze, "Economic Dominants in Community Power Structure," *American Sociological Review*, 23 (February, 1958), pp. 3-9; and Delbert C. Miller, "Industry and Community Power Structure: A Comparative Study of an American and an English City," *ibid.*, pp. 9-15. An interesting exception is Edwin Rhyne, "Political Parties in the Decision-Making Process," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September, 1957.

numbered self-identified Republicans but the Republicans have been consistently more successful in state and national elections in Valley City than in Boomtown.² In both communities the partisan atmosphere on Main Street was predominantly Republican, although much more so in Valley City than in Boomtown. These partisan differences afford an especially good opportunity to examine the possible relationships between party and power structure at the community level. The Republicanism of the business community on the Main Streets of small towns and cities (outside of the South) is a fact frequently noted in the political literature. That Main Street plays an active if not dominant role in the functioning of local power structures is a fact receiving empirical underpinning in recent investigations of community power structure. The connection between these two facts is the central concern of this analysis.

Assumptions to Be Examined. A political scientist comments on the traditional Republicanism of Main Street as follows:

... Republicans number among their supporters by far the greater proportion of the business and professional groups who carry on in politics as a matter of course without changing their way of life. ... Republicans have a great many individual supporters who belong to ... organizations (in the community) that function continually, and without breaking step with their routine operation, can convert themselves into political organizations. ... [S]ociety is like a giant spider web of communication and contact, and Republicans tend to be stationed at the centers of contact and communications with society at large. As full-time politicians, such contact, controllers and opinion leaders can easily bring to bear upon the political process their strong influences and political leadership. In brief, the normal structure provides an informal Republican party organization.³

This view of Main Street as "the natural organization" of the Republican party seems

² Valley City has voted more heavily Republican in presidential, gubernatorial, and congressional elections than the state, which had itself been Republican for many years. Boomtown has consistently been more Democratic than the state, with a Democratic majority in the 1948 presidential election and in the 1954 gubernatorial election when the state went solidly Republican.

³ Alfred deGrazia, *The Western Public*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1954, p. 185.

to rest on the following interlocking assumptions:

1. A positive and substantial relationship exists between socio-economic status (SES) and Republican party identification.
2. A positive and substantial relationship is to be found between SES and participation in community organizations.
3. Therefore, Republicans dominate the organizational membership structure (OMS) in the community.⁴
4. Republican domination of the organizational membership structure creates or reinforces a Republican atmosphere on Main Street, if not throughout the community.
5. The Republican atmosphere on Main Street increases Republican electoral strength by weakening Democratic party loyalties.

The recent community power structure studies suggest (implicitly) a further elaboration of the foregoing assumptions which augments the view of Main Street as the natural organization of the Republican Party.

6. The dominants in the local power structure are or have been (or have as their agents) dominants in the organizational membership structure.
7. Therefore, Republicans dominate the local power structure (because Republicans dominate the organizational membership structure).
8. Republican domination of the local power structure in a legally non-partisan community either: (a) does not reinforce a Republican atmosphere throughout the community because the top leaders in a local power structure are, or are perceived to be, non-partisan; or (b) further reinforces a Republican atmosphere on Main Street, if not throughout the community.

Research Methods. The two major research methods for examining these assump-

⁴ Participation in community organizations is conceived as the organizational membership structure (the OMS). The OMS is the formally organized social structure in action. As the social structure has strata, so too does the OMS. John M. Foskett developed an index for position in the OMS based on membership and activity scores. Those with the highest scores are in the top stratum of the OMS; they tend to control organizational policy-making. Some of those in the top stratum, the dominants, in the OMS may not receive high scores because of membership in many organizations; rather, they may participate actively in two or three organizations. Cf. Roland J. Pellegrin and Charles H. Coates, "Absentee-owned Corporations and Community Power Structure," *American Journal of Sociology*, 61 (March, 1956), pp. 415-416, and Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953, pp. 85-87.

tions in our two communities were a random sample survey in each community and participant observation.⁵ The survey in Valley City was approximately a ten per cent sample of the adults living outside the city limits and in the surrounding fringe areas (260 respondents). In Boomtown the survey was approximately a five per cent sample, with half of the respondents living within the city and half in the fringe (752 respondents).

Two techniques were used to identify top leaders: nominations by respondents in the samples of the most influential community policy-makers; the judgments of the participant observers. There was a considerable consensus between the two.⁶

The Two Communities. The smaller community, Valley City, gives one the impression of stability. The population has remained comparatively stable, less than doubling in size from 1930 to 1950.⁷ Boomtown has been one of the fastest growing communities in the state. Its population has increased more than five times between 1930 and 1950. The major economic activity in Valley City is retail trade. In Boomtown about 35 per cent of the population is engaged in manufacturing, with almost 90 per cent of the manufacturing related to the lumber industry. Most of the industry is absentee-owned. In the Valley City sample, almost 20 per cent of the respondents were farmers as compared with less than one per cent of the sample in Boomtown. The percentage of the population deriving its principal income from wages or salaries was 84 per cent in Boomtown and 54 per cent in Valley City. Workers in Boomtown were the more heavily unionized.

Valley City is about fifteen miles from

Big City on a major U. S. and state highway. Big City is a retail trading, university, and governmental center for the area. People living in the country between Big City and Valley City had begun to shop more extensively in Big City. Even Valley City residents were beginning to desert the home-town merchants, a trend of great concern to the latter. The seasonal fluctuations in the lumbering industry of the area added to the insecurities of the merchants of Main Street.

Boomtown is adjacent to and is the industrial hand-maiden of Big City. The major economic problem in Boomtown has been the depressed and unstable condition of the one major industry in the community—lumbering and associated activities.

Politics and Power Structures. During the period of the study the Democrats had almost no formal organization in Valley City. The one organized partisan activity during the national election period in 1952 was an informal dinner meeting arranged at the home of one of the few visible Democrats on Main Street. The Republicans in Valley City were organized and represented in the Republican councils of the county and state. There was a Republican state legislator from Valley City. Perhaps because of the absence of organized local opposition, organized Republican activity at election or other times did not seem to be very great. Even though registered Democrats outnumbered registered Republicans in the community, there was a general feeling that continued Republican domination was inevitable.

In contrast, in Boomtown, both parties were organized and active locally. Republican strength was centered on Main Street. Democratic organization, although weaker and more informal than that of the Republicans, included professional persons and some businessmen as well as labor union people. This differed dramatically from the situation in Valley City where it was extremely difficult to spot Democrats among the merchants and professional men on Main Street. There was not a single admitted Democrat in the officialdom of Valley City. In Boomtown Democrats held a few governmental offices.

Among the group of top leaders in Valley City, three men stood out as the most influential. All three at the time of the study had governmental positions. The senior leader of

⁵ The sample surveys as well as a description of general socio-political participation in Valley City and Boomtown are described by John M. Foskett, "Social Structure and Social Participation," *American Sociological Review*, 20 (August, 1955), pp. 431-438. Boomtown is there referred to as Valley City II.

⁶ On the value of different methods of identifying top leaders, see Schulze and Blumberg, *op. cit.*; John M. Foskett and Raymond Hohle, "The Measurement of Influence in Community Affairs," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, 25 (June, 1957), pp. 148-154; and Robert E. Agger, "Power Attributions in the Local Community," *Social Forces*, 34 (May, 1956), pp. 322-331.

⁷ Population data for the two communities are from Census reports and from the sample surveys.

the community, the state legislator, was a wealthy automobile dealer as well as a large property owner. His son-in-law was the mayor, and the mayor's brother, the third most influential person, was a member of the school board. Associated closely with these three in an effective policy-making group which met regularly to discuss community affairs were seven or eight respected members of the business community. On all important policy questions one or more of these men was consulted. Almost all of these top leaders served actively in the highest positions in the civic organizations. A card-playing club afforded a regular meeting time and place for group discussion. In interviews, these men repeatedly expressed a sentiment for keeping Valley City small and stable in the image of Jeffersonian democracy. Big City was viewed as a horrible example of what might happen to Valley City if it ever became a "boomtown."

The local government officials, some of whom were top leaders, agreed that the role of local government should be that of passive house-keeper for the community. Rather than play a more active role in influencing the future urban or industrial growth of Valley City, the local government was following *status quo* policies. These included decisions not to annex new territory, not to extend

city sewer and other services beyond the town limits, not to grant any tax or other concessions for new business or industry, and to retain a low tax rate with a minimum of expenditures for community improvements.

A few merchants openly expressed the view that the *status quo* policies of Valley City leaders were certain to lead to economic ruin. Some of these men tried to establish a Chamber of Commerce in order to set about the task of bringing more industry into the community. At the time of the study this effort had been thwarted through pressure brought to bear by the top leaders on the dissidents, pressure ranging from argument to social ostracism to economic boycott.

Local government in Boomtown was more dynamic and growth-oriented. In this rapidly growing city the need for providing more adequate services of all kinds was pressing. Local government was attempting to meet this need and to do something about the major problem of seasonal unemployment. New firms were encouraged to locate in Boomtown in order to diversify the economy.

Overshadowing these issues, however, was the matter of public versus private power in Boomtown. The period between the end of World War II and 1950 was marked by poor quality of service provided by the private utility company of the area. By the late

TABLE 1. RELATIONSHIP OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (SES) TO PARTY IDENTIFICATION *

	Valley City				Boomtown			
	Reps. %	Dems. %	Totals %	No.	Reps. %	Dems. %	Totals %	No.
Education								
Grades 1-9	39	61	100	92	39	61	100	234
High School	44	57	100	95	32	68	100	314
College	56	44	100	39	62	38	100	90
Income								
Under \$3,000	51	49	100	63	45	55	100	132
\$3,000-\$3,999	31	69	100	52	36	64	100	141
\$4,000-\$9,999	44	56	100	90	35	65	100	326
\$10,000 and over	55	45	100	11	76	24	100	25
Occupation								
Business and Professional	53	47	100	38	45	55	100	100
Farmers	41	59	100	22	60	40	100	5
Skilled and semiskilled	34	66	100	38	34	66	100	174
Unskilled	48	52	100	21	32	68	100	78

The relationship between Republicanism and both education and income in Boomtown is significant at the .001 level, using chi-square.

* All tables are based on data collected from the random samples.

TABLE 2. RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP (OMS) PARTICIPATION TO EDUCATION LEVEL

	Valley City					Boomtown				
	College	High School	Grades 1-9	Totals		College	High School	Grades 1-9	Totals	
				%	No.				%	No.
High OMS	33	36	31	100	64	32	51	17	100	109
Medium OMS	14	44	42	100	100	12	49	39	100	288
Low OMS	7	45	48	100	62	9	49	42	100	241

The relationship between OMS participation and education is significant at the .01 level in Valley City, and at the .001 level in Boomtown.

1940s a number of people, particularly young politicians, were demanding that Boomtown build a competing municipal utility system. After widespread discussion the voters gave resounding approval to such a proposition. But the establishment of the municipal utility did not end the controversy, which continued to color politics in Boomtown. Party identifications seem to have meant relatively little on this issue. Some Republicans took positions supporting the municipal utility without rejecting their party's national position in favor of private power. And some Democrats opposed the municipal utility. City Hall itself was not unified in favor of the municipal power system.

In this expansion era in Boomtown the political pie, as represented by local offices, had not yet been firmly divided nor had permanent accommodations been reached by contending groups. There was little of the sort of hierarchical power structure found in

Valley City. There was much less consensus among Boomtowners than among the residents of Valley City about who were the most influential people—the popular view on this point corresponds to the findings of the research team. Boomtown had a polynucleated set of leadership groups at the top of the power structure. Around top leaders were numerous small and relatively impermanent cliques often containing both Republicans and Democrats.

Testing the Assumptions. Do the assumptions underlying the conception of Main Street as the natural organization of the Republican party apply to Valley City and Boomtown?

1. A positive and substantial relationship exists between socio-economic status (SES) and Republican party identification.

This assumption seems to be accepted generally and uncritically by political sociologists. Empirical findings do substantiate the

TABLE 3. RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP (OMS) PARTICIPATION TO PARTY IDENTIFICATION, BY EDUCATION LEVEL

	Valley City					Boomtown				
	High OMS	Medium OMS	Low OMS	Totals		High OMS	Medium OMS	Low OMS	Totals	
				%	No.				%	No.
College										
Rep.	50	45	5	100	22	30	52	18	100	56
Dem.	23	59	18	100	17	18	53	29	100	34
High School										
Rep.	12	61	27	100	41	8	54	38	100	102
Dem.	9	59	32	100	54	6	57	37	100	211
Grades 1-9										
Rep.	5	64	31	100	36	2	58	40	100	92
Dem.	5	61	34	100	56	1	54	45	100	142

positive relationship, but few studies have specified its size. In our two communities the relationships of the three indices of SES (education, income and occupation) to Republicanism vary considerably. Some of these relationships are statistically significant and others are not (Table 1). Some differences are large and some are small.⁸ In order to give the benefit of any doubt to the assumptions discussed below, we consider that this initial assumption is supported by the evidence although in need of revision.⁹

2. A positive and substantial relationship is to be found between SES and participation in community organizations.

There is a positive, statistically significant relationship between SES and participation in community organizations in both communities (Table 2).

3. Therefore, Republicans dominate the organizational membership structure in the community.

In both Valley City and Boomtown, Republicans do dominate the OMS. The critical question, however, is whether this assumption is supported *because* of the relationship between SES and Republicanism (assumption 1, above). An alternative explanation for the finding that Republicans dominate the OMS concerns the psychological inhibiting-facilitating functions of partisan self-identifications. Democratic party identification may function psychologically to repress participation by Democrats in community organizations dominated by Republicans. In order to test which of these hypotheses holds, education is held constant.

There are differences (although they are statistically insignificant) between levels of participation in the OMS of the college edu-

cated Democrats and Republicans in both communities (Table 3). Assumption 3 must be revised because it is not sufficient to account for the lower OMS scores of equally well-educated Democrats. The assumption may be rephrased as follows:

Republicans dominate the OMS partly because they are of higher SES than Democrats, and partly because the latter may be inhibited by their partisan self-identification from participating in the upper strata of the community's OMS.

4. Republican domination of the organizational membership structure creates or reinforces a Republican atmosphere on Main Street, if not throughout the community.

Our estimate of the partisan atmosphere on Main Street is based for the most part upon two types of evidence: first, the visibility of Republicans as compared with Democrats on Main Street; and second, the assessment of the partisan content of informal discussion in organizational contexts.

Concerning visibility, the field workers shared the feeling that there was not a single Democrat on Valley City's Main Street, although the sample survey proved this impression to be incorrect. In Boomtown there were obviously some Democrats on Main Street but the research team again was surprised by the number of self-identified Democrats in the business community that turned up in the sample survey.

The Republican partisan atmosphere could probably be assessed more accurately by devising systematic sampling methods to measure the partisan content in the flow of discussion within the community organizations. Although we have used no such refined measure, participant observers independently agreed that the partisan discussion occurring in organizational settings was predominantly pro-Republican, although more so in Valley City than in Boomtown.

5. The Republican atmosphere on Main Street increases Republican electoral strength by weakening Democratic party loyalties.

Democratic party loyalties presumably may be weakened in one of three ways: by weakening or transforming Democratic party identifications; by inhibiting Democrats from accepting official positions in the local

⁸ A difference which is statistically significant at the .001 level may be small and "essentially meaningless for sociology at present," while others may be statistically significant below the five per cent level in a small sample and "be of major theoretical importance." Hanan C. Selvin, "A Critique of Tests of Significance in Survey Research," *American Sociological Review*, 22 (October, 1957), p. 524.

⁹ Education is the index of SES most closely related to socio-political participation in both communities and is used as the central index throughout this analysis. See Foskett, *op. cit.*

party organization; or by keeping Democrats inactive in informal party activities.¹⁰

In Valley City, the Republican atmosphere did not seem to weaken or transform Democratic party identifications (50 per cent Democrats, 39 per cent Republicans and 11 per cent independents). In spite of the pervasive Republican climate on Main Street, 47 per cent of the businessmen and white collar workers were self-identified Democrats (Table 1). There was no discernible increase in the number of self-identified independents, which, if it had been present, would possibly have been an indication of a first step in transition to a Republican orientation or an attempt to "pass" in a hostile partisan environment.¹¹

No Democratic local party organization existed, nor were Democrats as active as Republicans in informal party activities, as judged by the research team. The Republican atmosphere, while not undermining Democratic party identifications, functioned to inhibit more overt partisan activity.

Like the Main Street merchants in Valley City, those in Boomtown also retained their Democratic self-identifications (Table 1). The strong Republican atmosphere on Boomtown's Main Street, although less pervasive than that in Valley City, neither prevented some Democrats from participating in official positions in the local party organization nor inhibited their informal party activities.

6. The dominants in the local power structure are or have been (or have as their agents) dominants in the organizational membership structure.

Recent studies of community power structures have found two types of top leadership. In one type, the leaders, those who exercise maximum influence in important community policy-making, are the economic dominants.¹² In the other, top leaders are from somewhat lower strata in the economic

structure in the community.¹³ It has been suggested that this second situation occurs when major local industries are absentee-owned.¹⁴ In both types of power structures, however, the top leaders reportedly have had a background of high OMS activity.

In Valley City the economic dominants were among the top leaders. All such leaders were themselves active in the OMS, as well as having agents who were high OMS people. In Boomtown the economic dominants and top leaders were for the most part two separate groups. Some of these leaders achieved their positions through, and operated primarily in, other than OMS channels. These persons were Democrats and the channels were political and governmental.

7. Therefore, Republicans dominate the local power structure (because Republicans dominate the organizational membership structure).

This assumption holds for Valley City but not for Boomtown. Even though Republicans dominated the OMS in Boomtown (Table 3), Democrats were among the top leaders.

In the local power structure, there exists a second level, consisting of participants in the making of community policy who are not however perceived as top leaders. This group participates, though not as extensively as the top leaders, in most of the policy-oriented discussion, advising and advocacy. Most of these "second-level" persons relate themselves to top leaders by interacting or identifying with them. A composite index of participation in community policy-making based in large part on discussion of community policy matters was used as the measure of participation in the local power structure.

Democrats and Republicans were about equal participants in Boomtown's power structure. Holding education constant, a small, statistically insignificant relationship is found between Republicanism and high participation among the college-educated (Table 4). This Republican advantage is overcome, however, by the positive relationship between Democratic party identification and high participation among the high school-educated.

¹⁰ Perhaps the key informal party activity is conversation: talking, advocating, and advising about partisan matters, especially electoral matters.

¹¹ These functions of self-identification as an independent are discussed in Robert E. Agger, "Independents and Party Identifiers: Characteristics and Behavior in 1952," in Arthur Brodbeck and Eugene Burdick (editors), *American Voting Behavior*, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press (forthcoming).

¹² For example: Hunter, *op. cit.*; Delbert C. Miller, *op. cit.*; Pellegrin and Coates, *op. cit.*

¹³ For example: Schulze and Blumberg, *op. cit.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

TABLE 4. RELATIONSHIP OF PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL POWER STRUCTURE TO PARTY IDENTIFICATION, BY EDUCATION LEVEL

	Valley City					Boomtown				
	Participation:			Totals		Participation:			Totals	
	High	Medium	Low			High	Medium	Low		
	%	%	%	%	No.	%	%	%	%	No.
College										
Rep.	82	14	4	100	22	66	30	4	100	56
Dem.	59	35	6	100	17	56	44	0	100	34
High School										
Rep.	39	46	15	100	41	32	53	15	100	102
Dem.	32	44	24	100	54	42	45	13	100	212
Grades 1-9										
Rep.	14	61	25	100	36	22	53	25	100	92
Dem.	16	55	29	100	56	23	51	26	100	142

In Valley City there is a larger (though statistically insignificant) relationship between Republicanism and participation in the power structure among the college-educated.

Our findings in reference to assumptions 6 and 7 suggest that in Valley City the local power structure substantially overlaps the organizational membership structure for the top leaders and the "second-level" participants. Highly educated Democrats participate less in both structures and there are no Democrats in the top leadership group. In Boomtown the two structures are not as overlapping. Democrats participate less than Republicans in the OMS but equally in the power structure, and Democrats are among the top leaders.

8. Republican domination of the local power structure in a legally non-partisan community either: (a) does not reinforce a Republican atmosphere throughout the community because the top leaders in a local power structure are, and are perceived to be, non-partisan; or (b) further reinforces a Republican atmosphere on Main Street, if not throughout the community.

Other studies of community power structures do not specifically discuss the partisan complexion or functions of the structures. Presumably top leaders are assumed to deal in non-partisan fashion with matters of community policy, especially where local government is technically non-partisan. On the other hand, even in a non-partisan setting, it is possible that a top leadership group consisting

almost entirely of members of one party can enhance the prestige and status of that party and weaken the party loyalties of the opposition.

Assumption 8 does not apply to Boomtown because Republicans did not dominate the local power structure.

Valley City had non-partisan elections and the top leaders did not participate in community policy-making, at least publicly, as partisan Republicans. Republican domination of the local power structure did not reinforce the Republican atmosphere in the community. But this is not because the top leaders were perceived to be non-partisan (as suggested in 8, a). Democrats nominated Democrats as top leaders and Republicans nominated Republicans. This partisan difference in perceptions of top leaders was not due to differences in education or level of participation (Table 5).

The local power structure, then, in "non-partisan" Valley City, was perceived in a partisan frame of reference. A similar pattern of partisan perceptions was found in Boomtown (Table 5). Although the number of cases is very small, the data in Table 5 suggest that partisanship affects perceptions to the greatest extent among the highly educated and the highly participant. It is these people whom one might expect to be most sensitive to party affiliations of top leaders. Not only does their education make them more alert to political facts of life than their

TABLE 5. RELATIONSHIP OF TOP LEADER NOMINATIONS TO PARTY IDENTIFICATION, BY EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL POWER STRUCTURE

	Valley City					Boomtown					
	Top 3 Leaders %	Others %	No One %	Totals %	No.	Top 2 Re- publi- cans %	Top 2 Demo- crats %	Others %	No One %	Totals %	No.
Education											
Level											
College											
Rep.	77	18	5	100	22	16	5	36	43	100	56
Dem.	29	41	30	100	17	6	18	23	53	100	34
High School											
Rep.	44	37	19	100	41	14	15	25	46	100	102
Dem.	32	37	31	100	54	5	16	29	50	100	211
Grades 1-9											
Rep.	25	39	36	100	36	11	8	25	56	100	92
Dem.	38	32	30	100	56	6	9	25	60	100	142
Participation											
High											
Rep.	59	28	13	100	39	16	8	41	35	100	83
Dem.	39	36	25	100	36	7	21	39	33	100	136
Medium											
Rep.	41	41	18	100	44	13	12	22	53	100	120
Dem.	34	38	28	100	61	5	10	26	59	100	182
Low											
Rep.	19	25	56	100	16	5	5	20	70	100	40
Dem.	27	30	43	100	30	2	6	16	76	100	63

The relationship between Republicanism and nomination of the Top 3 Leaders among the college-educated in Valley City is significant at the .01 level.

Comparing the nominations of only the top two Republicans and the top two Democrats in Boomtown: the relationship between party identification of respondents and nomination of top leaders of the same party is significant among the college-educated at the .05 level (using the Fisher Exact Test), among the high school-educated at the .05 level, and among high participants at the .01 level.

fellows, but their participation in the power structure affords them the opportunity to see through political myths of non-partisanship.

Assumption 8 must therefore be revised to read:

Republican domination of the local power structure in a legally non-partisan community does not reinforce a Republican atmosphere throughout the community because: (a) Democrats tend to perceive or identify themselves with top leaders who are Democrats, or (b) Democrats fail to perceive or identify themselves with Republican top leaders.

Summary. This comparative study of two towns in the West has led to qualifications in several assumptions about relationships among community social and political structures and partisanship. The Republican

atmosphere on Main Street, especially in the community organizations, did not lead to conversion so much as it inhibited the expression of Democratic loyalties. Under certain conditions, as in Boomtown, this atmosphere does not even function to inhibit such expression. When Democrats hold important positions in the local power structure, as they did in Boomtown, channels exist for the activation of Democratic loyalties.

Control by the economic dominants in Valley City of the overlapping organizational membership and power structures discouraged Democratic activities in local politics. When economic dominants do not control the power structure, as they did not in Boomtown, opportunities exist for Democrats

to move directly into top leader positions without a long apprenticeship in the Republican-dominated social structure.

The efficacy of the natural organization of the Republican party on Main Street there-

fore depends on the partisan complexion of the community power structure, which in turn depends upon the relationships among the local power, economic and social structures.

THE ECOLOGY OF THE AMERICAN CITY: FURTHER COMPARISON AND VALIDATION OF GENERALIZATIONS

CALVIN F. SCHMID

University of Washington

EARLE H. MACCANNELL

San Diego State College

MAURICE D. VAN ARSDOL, JR.*

University of Southern California

THE principal objective of this paper is to determine the stability, comparability and reliability of a series of generalizations concerning the ecological structure of the American city which were derived from an analysis of 1940 census data.¹ The present study is largely a replication of the earlier one, but is based on entirely new data from 1950 census reports.

In the original study twenty American cities with populations between 200,000 and 500,000 were selected for analysis. The selection of these cities was based mainly on criteria of comparability such as size of total population, territorial size, number and average size of census tracts, and on representativeness of these cities with respect to economic type, geographical distribution, site, population composition, and rate of population growth. Two smaller cities—Berkeley, California, and Macon, Georgia—and one larger city—Detroit, Michigan—were selected for comparative purposes. Census tract data for the twenty-three cities consisting of twelve different indices representing sex, age, race, nativity, income, education, occupation, employment, and fertility were subjected to correlational analysis.

* Assisted by Heinz J. Graafls, William Eugene Torget, Robert E. Pelz, Joseph W. Rogers and Calvin Wright. Acknowledgment also is made to the Research Committee of the Graduate School of the University of Washington for financial assistance.

¹ Calvin F. Schmid, "Generalizations Concerning the Ecology of the American City," *American Sociological Review*, 15 (April, 1950), pp. 264-281.

The study indicated that in 1940 the ecological structure of the large American city conformed to a consistent, pervasive, and regular pattern in which the socio-economic status of the population was a dominant feature. The following generalizations from the study are presented as further clarification and validation of this basic observation:

1. The most highly intercorrelating variable in the socio-economic status dimension of the ecological structure of the city is the educational status of the population, as measured by median school grade completed.
2. High status occupational groups such as professional workers, and proprietors, managers, and officials tend to segregate in high-income areas. Low status occupational groups, such as laborers, tend to segregate in low-rent areas.
3. There is a high correlation between educational status and mean rent, income, occupation, and employment status.
4. Negroes and foreign-born whites tend to reside in low-income areas.
5. Fertility, as measured by the fertility ratio, is inversely related to socio-economic status, and the spatial patterning of children under fifteen years of age is similar to that of the fertility ratio.
6. There is an inverse relationship between the percentage of the population classified as male and socio-economic status.
7. In most large cities, older people tend to live in high income areas. On the other hand, as the proportion of the population in the older age-groups increases for the city as a whole, an inverse relationship in the ecological patterning between the older population and mean rent tends to occur.

TABLE 1. POPULATION, AREA, DENSITY, NUMBER OF CENSUS TRACTS AND MEAN SIZES (AREA AND POPULATION) OF CENSUS TRACTS FOR SAMPLE OF 20 CITIES OF COMPARABLE SIZE WITH SUPPLEMENTARY DATA FOR ONE SMALL, ONE INTERMEDIATE, AND ONE LARGE CITY: 1940 AND 1950

CITY	Total Population			Land Area			Population Density			Number of Census Tracts		Mean size of Census Tracts			
	Number	1940	1950	Rank	Size (Sq. M.)	Rank	People per Sq. M.	Rank	1940	1950	Rank	1940	1950	1940	1950
SAMPLE CITIES															
Akron	244,791	274,605	19	18	53.7	8	4,558	19	5,114	16	57	57	4,295	4,818	94.2
Atlanta	302,288	331,314	11	14	34.7	18	8,512	5	8,979	7	75	75	4,031	4,418	4.65
Birmingham	267,583	326,037	17	15	50.2	11	5,330	17	4,933	17	52	52	5,146	5,621	9.65
Cincinnati	455,610	503,998	3	3	72.4	2	6,293	13	6,711	11	107	107	4,258	4,582	6.77
Columbus	306,087	375,901	9	10	39.0	14	7,848	7	9,541	4	61	61	5,018	6,162	6.39
Dallas	294,734	434,462	13	6	40.6	13	7,259	9	8,879	18	58	58	5,082	4,526	7.00
Dayton	210,718	243,872	20	20	23.7	19	8,891	4	9,755	2	53	53	3,976	4,516	4.47
Indianapolis	386,972	427,173	5	7	53.6	6	7,220	10	7,739	9	107	110	3,617	3,883	5.01
Kansas City	399,178	456,622	4	5	58.6	5	6,812	11	5,665	15	92	108	4,339	4,228	6.37
Louisville	319,077	369,129	8	12	37.9	15	8,419	6	9,251	5	89	90	3,585	4,101	4.26
Memphis	292,942	396,000	14	8	45.6	14	6,424	12	3,800	19	75	90	3,906	4,400	6.08
Minneapolis	492,370	521,718	2	2	53.8	7	9,152	3	9,697	3	121	121	4,069	4,312	4.45
New Orleans	494,537	570,445	1	1	199.4	1	2,480	20	2,861	20	133	142	3,718	4,017	1.404
Oakland	302,163	384,575	12	9	52.8	9	5,723	14	7,256	10	72	72	4,197	5,341	7.33
Portland	305,394	373,628	10	11	63.5	4	4,809	18	5,829	14	60	61	5,090	6,125	1.051
Providence	253,504	248,674	18	19	17.9	20	14,162	1	13,892	1	49	37	5,174	6,721	3.65
Rochester	324,975	332,488	7	13	34.8	17	9,338	2	9,236	6	88	88	3,693	3,778	3.95
Seattle	368,302	467,591	6	4	68.5	3	5,377	16	6,604	12	79	94	4,662	4,974	8.67
St. Paul	287,736	311,349	15	16	52.2	10	5,512	15	5,965	13	76	76	3,786	4,097	6.87
Toledo	282,349	303,616	16	17	37.1	16	7,611	8	7,927	8	55	55	5,134	5,520	6.75
SMALL CITY															
Berkeley	85,547	113,805	-	-	9.4	9.5	9,101	-	11,979	-	26	26	3,290	4,377	3.62
INTERMEDIATE CITY															
San Francisco ..	634,536	775,357	-	-	44.6	44.6	14,227	-	17,385	-	118	118	5,377	6,571	3.78
LARGE CITY															
Detroit	1,623,452	1,849,568	-	-	137.9	139.6	11,773	-	13,249	-	369	369	4,400	5,012	3.74

In order to maintain comparability between the two studies, an effort was made to include the same cities in the follow-up analysis, and wherever possible, to utilize similar data and basic analytical techniques. Of course, certain changes have occurred both in the data and in the characteristics of the cities between the earlier study and the present one. These differences may be summarized as follows: (1) All of the cities except one have increased to a greater or lesser extent in total population. (2) Several cities have grown territorially. (3) One of the major indices in the earlier study, mean rent for both owner- and tenant-occupied dwelling units, was not available in the 1950 census; another index, median income, was substituted. (4) Two of the principal indices in the current study, median income and median grade completed, are based on a 20 per cent sample rather than on complete enumeration. Although these differences may not be considered serious enough to invalidate comparisons between the two studies, nevertheless they must be recognized and carefully evaluated.

In the follow-up analysis, the 20 cities in the original primary sample were included. Macon was excluded as one of the two smaller cities because of lack of published data. Detroit was retained as the larger city and San Francisco was added to provide comparison with a city of intermediate size.

Table I summarizes for both 1940 and 1950 basic descriptive data concerning each of the 23 cities included in the present study. In 1950 the populations of the cities in the primary sample ranged from 243,872 for Dayton to 570,445 for New Orleans. There were three cities with populations of 200,000-299,999; ten cities of 300,000-399,999; four cities of 400,000-499,999, and three cities of 500,000-599,999. All of the 20 cities except Providence showed an increase in population between 1940 and 1950. Among the 20 cities in the primary sample, 15 expanded territorially while five remained the same in area during the 1940-50 decennial period. The most noteworthy territorial expansion occurred in two southern cities, Dallas and Memphis. The land area of Dallas was increased from 40.6 to 112.0 square miles and that of Memphis from 45.6 to 104.2 square miles. The land areas

of the 20 cities varied from 17.9 square miles for Providence to 199.4 square miles for New Orleans. The density of population per square mile ranged from a minimum of 2,861 for New Orleans to 13,892 for Providence. As a consequence of territorial expansion, change in total population, or both between 1940 and 1950 the density index shifted for 20 of the cities. In the case of six cities there was a decline in density and in 14 cities, an increase. Another significant change between 1940 and 1950 was the complete revision of census tract boundaries for Providence which reduced the number of census tracts from 49 to 37. Because of the growing importance of military establishments since 1940 as well as the atypicality of institutional populations, census tracts which contained more than ten per cent military population, institutional population, or both were excluded from the 1950 analysis. The 1950 analysis also excluded census tracts with total populations of less than 100 people.

CENSUS TRACT INDICES

The basic data used in the present study are represented by twelve indices arranged according to census tracts for the 23 cities in the total sample. All of these indices possess important sociological significance. Our primary interest in these indices is to utilize them as an objective means of confirming or refuting several "established" generalizations concerning the ecological structure of the American city.

Tables 2 and 3 indicate that most of the indices appear to reflect socio-economic status. Although these indices are to a greater or lesser degree interrelated, they can be subsumed under the following general categories:

Income: (1) contract or estimated monthly mean rent (1940 data only); (2) median income for total families and unrelated individuals (1950 data only).

Occupational status: proportion of population in the labor force classified as (1) professional workers, (2) proprietors, managers and officials, and (3) laborers.

Employment status: proportion of population in the labor force classified as unemployed.

Educational status: (1) proportion of the population 25 years of age and over classified as college graduates, and (2) median school-grade completed for population 25 years of age and over.

Race and nativity: percentage of total population classified as (1) Negro and (2) foreign-born white.

Fertility: ratio of children under five years of age to females 15 to 44 years of age.

Sex: proportion of total population classified as males.

Age: proportion of total population (1) 60 years of age and over and (2) under 15 years of age.

CORRELATION OF MEDIAN GRADE COMPLETED WITH OTHER INDICES

The study for 1940 indicated that educational status as measured by median school grade completed was the variable most highly intercorrelated with other status measures in the ecological structure of the city.

Table 2 summarizes Pearsonian coefficients of correlation between median grade completed and ten other variables for 23 cities for both 1940 and 1950. The sign and size of the coefficients are very similar for 1940 and 1950. With respect to direction of relationship there is complete agreement between median grade and six of the variables, whereas in the remaining four there are very few exceptions.

The six variables that show no deviation in the direction of relationship from 1940 to 1950 are professional workers (+), proprietors, managers, and officials (+), laborers (-), unemployed (-), Negroes (-), and fertility ratio (-). In the case of percentage of population under 15 years of age, there is only one city—Seattle—that shows a positive relationship, and this occurred in both 1940 and 1950. For percentage males there are two cities—Atlanta and Birmingham—that do not conform consistently with the negative pattern for that index, but it should be pointed out that the coefficients of correlation are extremely small. The pattern of correlation for the index, 60 years of age and over, is less stable than percentage males, but in general the relationships are positive for most cities. In the case of the foreign-born white, both the direction of re-

lationship as well as the size of the coefficients of correlation between 1940 and 1950 show the greatest instability. This trend is to be expected since the proportion of the foreign-born in the population has shown a marked diminution since 1940. Besides the unprecedented influx of Negroes into many cities, commercial and industrial expansion and the assimilation process itself have had a marked impact on the residential pattern of the foreign-born. Furthermore, the differentials in the coefficients of correlation which are found from one city to another no doubt are influenced by the sources of immigration. In Seattle, for example, most of the foreign-born white are from Canada and Northern Europe, whereas in other cities the preponderance of foreign-born are from Southern and Eastern Europe.

The size of the coefficients of correlation also show variations for the two periods of time as well as for the various indices. The more salient facts based on the primary sample of 20 cities may be summarized as follows: (1) The size of the coefficients of correlation between median grade completed and percentage professional workers for 1940 varied between $+.55$ to $+.90$, and for 1950, between $+.51$ to $+.92$. As will be observed in Table 4, the mean of the coefficients of correlation for 1940 is $+.78$ with a coefficient of variation of 9.5 per cent, and for 1950 is $+.82$ with a coefficient of variation of 10.3 per cent. (2) The coefficients of correlation for percentage proprietors, managers, and officials for 1940 ranged from $+.70$ to $+.93$ with a mean of $+.82$; the corresponding figures for 1950 are from $+.60$ to $+.95$ and a mean of $+.77$. (3) The relationship with percentage laborers varied from $-.51$ to $-.85$ for 1940 with a mean of $-.74$ and $-.66$ to $-.88$ for 1950 with a mean of $-.77$. (4) In the case of the unemployed the correlation pattern also was definitely negative with a range of $-.68$ to $-.88$ in 1940 and $-.45$ to $-.89$ in 1950; the corresponding means were $-.78$ and $-.69$. (5) Of the 20 cities in the primary sample in Table 3, 10 had ten per cent or more of their population Negro in both 1940 and 1950. In addition, Detroit had ten per cent Negro population. The coefficients of correlation for these 11 cities varied from $-.35$ (Cincinnati) to $-.84$ (Birmingham).

TABLE 2. INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEDIAN GRADE COMPLETED AND CERTAIN VARIABLES BY CENSUS TRACTS FOR A SAMPLE OF 20 CITIES OF COMPARABLE SIZE WITH SUPPLEMENTARY DATA FOR ONE SMALLER, ONE INTERMEDIATE AND ONE LARGER CITY: 1940 AND 1950

CITY	Median Grade Completed for Population 25 Years and over Correlated with:															
	Foreign Born		Prof. Workers		Prop., Managers, etc.		Laborers		Unemployed		Age 60 and over		Under Age 15		Males	
	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940
SAMPLE CITIES																
Akron	-.18	-.42	+.51	+.72	+.78	+.89	-.81	-.60	-.55	-.82	+.17	+.23	-.14	-.48	-.67	-.75
Atlanta	-	-	+.76	+.72	+.73	+.83	-.86	-.83	-.70	-.85	+.55	+.58	-.67	-.71	-.07	+.01
Birmingham	-	-	+.80	+.75	+.95	+.93	-.88	-.82	-.72	-.82	+.55	+.72	-.68	-.63	+.05	-.02
Cincinnati	-	-	+.83	+.71	+.84	+.70	-.70	-.63	-.70	-.71	+.32	+.42	-.35	-.57	-.41	-.50
Columbus	-	-	+.83	+.80	+.78	+.82	-.69	-.75	-.82	-.73	+.09	+.46	-.34	-.60	-.18	-.54
Dallas	-	-	+.82	+.72	+.68	+.73	-.88	-.74	-.85	-.86	-.06	+.43	-.16	-.74	-.29	-.54
Dayton	-	-	+.86	+.82	+.77	+.83	-.65	-.72	-.59	-.68	+.07	+.08	-.26	-.36	-.45	-.56
Indianapolis	-	-	+.83	+.72	+.80	+.86	-.76	-.70	-.70	-.73	+.19	+.22	-.42	-.53	-.39	-.55
Kansas City	-	-	+.86	+.79	+.75	+.78	-.87	-.74	-.73	-.89	+.15	+.06	-.30	-.33	-.56	-.53
Louisville	-	-	+.91	+.90	+.84	+.89	-.69	-.72	-.67	-.72	+.42	+.47	-.40	-.47	-.54	-.62
Memphis	-	-	+.81	+.76	+.60	+.89	-.84	-.81	-.75	-.90	+.00	+.34	-.30	-.47	-.24	-.38
Minneapolis	-.46	-.62	+.79	+.75	+.60	+.72	-.80	-.71	-.45	-.68	-.03	+.13	-.28	-.45	-.36	-.63
New Orleans	-	-	+.78	+.75	+.87	+.85	-.78	-.75	-.61	-.83	+.37	+.59	-.37	-.53	-.19	-.32
Oakland	+.02	-.70	+.79	+.85	+.79	+.79	-.84	-.79	-.89	-.81	+.14	+.09	-.02	-.31	-.66	-.54
Portland	-.29	-.54	+.79	+.78	+.76	+.82	-.73	-.85	-.73	-.71	-.06	-.26	-.03	-.20	-.50	-.56
Providence ?	-.48	-.69	+.89	+.84	+.86	+.86	-.76	-.73	-.79	-.84	+.40	+.79	-.62	-.80	-.54	-.77
Rochester	-.20	-.73	+.88	+.78	+.65	+.75	-.68	-.51	-.64	-.77	+.30	+.49	-.28	-.49	-.55	-.53
Seattle	-.48	-.74	+.82	+.79	+.60	+.74	-.84	-.85	-.75	-.73	-.39	-.31	-.21	-.01	-.65	-.60
St. Paul	-.49	-.60	+.89	+.86	+.79	+.89	-.76	-.74	-.52	-.72	+.08	+.12	-.34	-.46	-.33	-.55
Toledo	-	-	+.92	+.86	+.90	+.93	-.66	-.75	-.59	-.76	+.64	+.08	-.20	-.37	-.51	-.65
SMALLER CITY																
Berkeley	-.08	-.81	+.94	+.95	+.72	+.79	-.75	-.89	-.85	-.73	+.36	+.43	-.38	-.48	-.30	-.79
INTERMEDIATE CITY																
San Francisco ..	-	-	+.70	-	+.52	-	-.54	-	-.57	-	+.25	-	-.20	-	-.72	-
LARGER CITY																
Detroit	+.19	-.37	+.89	+.83	+.78	+.79	-.68	-.65	-.58	-.75	+.20	+.26	-.16	-.31	-.42	-.47

*Only Cities with 10% or more foreign-born White or 10% or more Negro in 1940. Detroit included with 9.2% Negro; in 1950, Detroit had 16.2% Negro.

* Highest and † second highest coefficients of correlation

‡ Census tracts of Providence completely altered between 1940 and 1950.

and Memphis) for 1940 and from $-.43$ (Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and Louisville) to $-.88$ (Birmingham) in 1950. The mean for 1940 was $-.54$ with a coefficient of variation of 33.4 per cent and for 1950 the mean was $-.58$ and coefficient of variation 28.3 per cent.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MEAN RENT (1940)
AND MEDIAN INCOME (1950) AND
OTHER INDICES

Table 3 summarizes the coefficients of correlation of mean rent (1940) and median income (1950) with 11 other variables including median grade and percentage college graduates for the 23 cities. It must not be assumed, of course, that the 1940 correlations based on mean rent are directly comparable with the 1950 correlations based on median income.

With respect to the direction of association, there is complete agreement in both series with the following variables: percentage college graduates (+), median grade (+), professional workers (+), proprietors, managers and officials (+), laborers (-), unemployed (-), and Negroes (-).

In the case of percentage males, the pattern is consistently negative for 1940 and for 1950 with but one exception in 1950. The single city with a positive correlation (+.20) in 1950 is Birmingham. The coefficients of correlation, however, are higher for the 1940 series.

The correlation between mean rent and the fertility ratio in 1940 conforms to a consistent negative pattern. In the case of median income (1950) the pattern is one which is predominantly positive. Fourteen of the 23 cities show positive coefficients, six are negative and three are zero. The upsurge in the birth rate in recent years, especially among white-collar and professional classes, may be reflected in this shifting ecological pattern. On the other hand, the fact that median income for 1950 was reported without distinction for families and unrelated individuals may indicate that both husbands and wives contributed to income in high fertility census tracts.

Similarly, in 1940 all but one city (Seattle +.24) follow a negative pattern for percentage under 15 years of age, but in 1950,

17 cities show positive correlations and six, negative.

Mean rent (1940) tended to be more positively correlated with percentage 60 years of age and over than median income (1950). In 1940, only five cities had negative coefficients as compared to 14 negative coefficients and three zero coefficients in 1950. This trend does not necessarily reflect a decline in the socio-economic status of the older population. Rather, it probably indicates that large proportions of older persons are living alone or with unrelated individuals.

With respect to the foreign-born white, the coefficients of correlation are uniformly negative in 1940, while in 1950 two cities showed positive coefficients, and in all but one of the remaining cities the coefficients were considerably lower.

The size of the coefficients of correlation between mean rent (1940) and median income (1950) and 12 other variables for the primary sample of 20 cities shows the following relationships. With percentage of college graduates the coefficients of correlation ranged from $+.79$ to $+.94$ for mean rent (1940) and $+.03$ to $+.81$ for median income (1950). The mean for the 1940 series is $+.89$ with a coefficient of variation of 5.6 per cent; the mean for 1950 is $+.50$ with a coefficient of variation of 43.1 per cent. Similarly, the other index of educational status, median grade completed, showed smaller coefficients for the 1950 than for the 1940 series. In the case of median income the coefficients of correlation ranged from $+.27$ to $+.87$ with a mean of $+.64$; the corresponding figures for mean rent were $+.81$ to $+.93$ and a mean of $+.87$. For the various occupational indices also the data on mean rent for 1940 indicated noticeably higher coefficients than the data on median income for 1950. For example, percentage professional workers recorded correlations from $+.48$ to $+.88$ with mean rent, and $+.06$ to $+.67$ for median income with respective means of $+.76$ and $+.48$. Only one city, Akron, showed a higher coefficient for median income ($+.55$) than for mean rent ($+.48$). Again, mean rent (1940) correlated more highly with percentage proprietors, managers and officials, than did median income (1950). The range of the coefficients of correlation for this index for mean rent

TABLE 3. INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEDIAN INCOME (1950) AND MEAN RENT (1940) AND CERTAIN VARIABLES BY CENSUS TRACTS FOR A SAMPLE OF 20 CITIES OF COMPARABLE SIZE WITH SUPPLEMENTARY DATA FOR ONE SMALLER, ONE INTERMEDIATE AND ONE LARGE CITY: 1940 AND 1950

CITY	Median Income (1950) and Mean Rent (1940) Correlated with:															
	Foreign Born		College Graduates		Prof. Workers		Prop., Managers, etc.		Laborers		Unemployed		Age 60 and over		Under Age 15	
	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940
SAMPLE CITIES																
Akron	-.04	-.32	+.81*	+.94*	+.55	+.48	+.86*	+.94*	-.65	-.50	-.16	-.74	+.09	+.09	+.05	-.33
Atlanta	-	-	+.54	+.90	+.28	+.86	+.71	+.90	-.69	-.62	-.59	-.83*	+.29	+.46	-.19	-.61
Birmingham ..	-	-	+.50	+.95*	+.55	+.84	+.84	+.95*	-.83*	-.73*	-.62	-.78	+.34	+.73*	-.38	-.72*
Cincinnati	-	-	+.55	+.85	+.53	+.67	+.77	+.89	-.69	-.59	-.82*	-.75	+.12	+.38	-.09	-.53
Columbus	-	-	+.15	+.82	+.34	+.76	+.76	+.89	-.48	-.67	-.69	-.72	+.00	+.32	+.33	-.44
Dallas	-	-	+.71	+.89	+.67*	+.79	+.84	+.85	-.45	-.59	-.67	-.73	+.35	+.39	+.20	-.64*
Dayton	-	-	+.53	+.82	+.64	+.81	+.70	+.89	-.70	-.75*	-.61	-.79	+.09	+.09	+.14	-.47
Indianapolis ..	-	-	+.73	+.91	+.62	+.71	+.89*	+.94*	-.68	-.67	-.69	-.72	+.03	+.21	-.07	-.47
Kansas City ..	-	-	+.78*	+.94*	+.66*	+.80	+.86*	+.91	-.54	-.58	-.61	-.73	+.04	+.08	+.13	-.26
Louisville	-	-	+.56	+.94*	+.60	+.85	+.73	+.86	-.75*	-.60	-.75	-.67	+.20	+.26	-.10	-.31
Memphis	-	-	+.65	+.87	+.62	+.75	+.62	+.94*	-.75*	-.71	-.70	-.84*	+.21	+.24	+.01	-.41
Minneapolis	-.09	-.50	+.19	+.79	+.19	+.57	+.71	+.89	-.50	-.71	-.56	-.80	+.26	+.06	+.51	-.20
New Orleans ...	-	-	+.60	+.91	+.52	+.73	+.82	+.91	-.69	-.63	-.67	-.77	+.16	+.50	-.12	-.43
Oakland	-.11	-.63*	+.70	+.90	+.66*	+.88*	+.82	+.87	-.63	-.64	-.81	-.77	+.28	+.09	+.39	-.13
Portland	-.51*	-.44	+.52	+.93	+.49	+.86	+.72	+.86	-.54	-.73*	-.77	-.78	+.46	+.32	+.53*	-.54
Providence?	+.15	-.58	+.03	+.95*	+.06	+.86	+.52	+.91	-.29	-.66	-.46	-.79	+.18	+.53*	+.19	-.51
Rochester	-.01	-.61	+.29	+.81	+.32	+.71	+.45	+.80	-.62	-.51	-.79	-.79	+.41	+.28	+.46	-.38
Seattle	-.40*	-.62*	+.41	+.87	+.44	+.74	+.71	+.87	-.51	-.67	-.70	-.72	+.59*	+.46	+.63*	+.24
St. Paul	-.31	-.63*	+.21	+.83	+.24	+.74	+.52	+.92	-.50	-.70	-.64	-.79	+.55*	+.13	+.09	-.33
Toledo	-	-	+.52	+.91	+.56	+.87*	+.69	+.94*	-.54	-.69	-.84*	-.77	+.32	+.09	+.25	-.58
SMALL CITY																
Berkeley	-.05	-.64	+.43	+.82	+.41	+.77	+.83	+.94	-.33	-.65	-.50	-.78	+.19	+.12	+.39	-.14
INTERMEDIATE CITY																
San Francisco ..	-	-	+.40	-	+.50	-	+.69	-	-.34	-	-.76	-	-.24	-	+.40	-
LARGE CITY																
Detroit	+.35	-.15	+.63	+.92	+.67	+.84	+.73	+.87	-.66	-.58	-.51	-.67	+.00	+.15	+.13	-.27

*Only cities with 10% or more foreign-born white or 10% or more Negro in 1940. Detroit included with 9.2% Negro; in 1950, Detroit had 16.2% Negro.

* Highest and * second highest coefficients of correlation (20 sample cities).

* Census tracts of Providence completely altered between 1940 and 1950.

TABLE 4. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND COEFFICIENTS OF VARIATION OF COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN MEDIAN INCOME (1950), MEAN RENT (1940) AND MEDIAN GRADE COMPLETED (1950 AND 1940) AND SPECIFIED VARIABLES FOR 20 CITIES IN PRIMARY SAMPLE

Variable and Year	Median Income (1950) and Mean Rent (1940)			Median Grade Completed (1950 and 1940)		
	\bar{X}	σ	c.v.	\bar{X}	σ	c.v.
Foreign Born White						
1950	-.16	.21	129.4	-.32	.18	55.3
1940	-.54	.11	19.5	-.63	.10	16.3
College Graduates						
1950	+.50	.22	43.1	—	—	—
1940	+.89	.05	5.6	—	—	—
Prof. Workers						
1950	+.48	.17	36.3	+.82	.08	10.3
1940	+.76	.10	13.3	+.78	.07	9.5
Prop., Mgrs., and Officials						
1950	+.73	.12	16.3	+.77	.10	12.7
1940	+.90	.04	4.2	+.82	.07	8.4
Laborers						
1950	-.60	.13	20.9	-.77	.08	9.8
1940	-.65	.07	10.6	-.74	.08	11.1
Unemployed						
1950	-.67	.11	15.7	-.69	.11	15.9
1940	-.76	.04	5.3	-.78	.07	8.7
60 years and over						
1950	-.13	.27	205.7	+.20	.25	122.9
1940	+.19	.28	149.6	+.26	.31	118.5
Under 15 years of age						
1950	+.17	.27	158.8	-.32	.18	55.4
1940	-.39	.20	52.5	-.47	.18	38.9
Males						
1950	-.29	.18	61.8	-.40	.20	48.9
1940	-.47	.15	32.0	-.51	.19	38.1
Negroes						
1950	-.60	.16	26.0	-.58	.16	28.3
1940	-.44	.18	40.3	-.54	.18	33.4
Children 0-4/Females 15-44						
1950	+.12	.21	171.4	-.29	.15	53.2
1940	-.47	.15	31.6	-.54	.11	21.3
Median Grade						
1950	+.64	.16	25.7	—	—	—
1940	+.87	.03	4.0	—	—	—

was +.80 to +.95 and for median income, +.45 to +.89. The relationship between mean rent (1940) and percentage laborers is indicated by coefficients ranging from a minimum of -.50 to a maximum of -.75; for median income the corresponding figures were -.33 to -.83.

Tables 3 and 4 present the size of the coefficients of correlation between the two primary indices of socio-economic status and

such remaining variables as population 60 years of age and over, population under 15 years of age, Negroes, foreign-born white, and fertility ratio. The lowest mean value of the coefficients of correlation for these five indices is between the fertility ratio and median income (1950), namely +.12. Population 60 years of age and over correlated with median income ranks second lowest with -.13. In every instance except Negroes the

mean coefficients of correlation for each of the respective variables are higher for mean rent.

GENERALIZATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Both this study and that made earlier by Schmid² provide an empirical basis for deriving a number of significant generalizations concerning the ecological structure of the urban community. Furthermore, since the purpose of the present study is to determine the stability and reliability of the generalizations derived from the earlier analysis, broader validity can now be claimed for some of these generalizations, although others require modification.

In both studies 20 representative cities of comparable size were chosen along with three smaller and larger cities for further analysis and comparison. Twelve different indices, involving approximately 2,100 census tracts, were utilized in each of these studies. Both studies clearly indicate that the ecological structure of the large American city manifests a regular and pervasive pattern in which the socio-economic status of the population is an important feature. This basic fact suggests a number of implications which can be expressed in the form of a series of specific generalizations:

1. The social structure of the urban community can be represented by a status-value ranking as determined by such factors as education, income, and occupation.

2. More specifically there is a pronounced and consistent patterning of the population with respect to education, occupation, and income. For example, for the 20 cities in the primary sample, the mean coefficients of correlation between the proportion of the population classified as proprietors, managers, and officials and median income (1950) is $+.73$, and between this index and mean rent (1940) is $+.90$. Relatively high inter-correlations also prevail among such indices as professional workers, college graduates, and median grade completed.

3. As would be expected, the percentage of the population classified as laborers shows a high, stable inverse relationship with the foregoing indices. For the 20 cities in the

basic sample the mean of the coefficients of correlation between percentage laborers and median grade completed is $-.77$ for 1950 and $-.74$ for 1940, and $-.60$ with median income (1950) and $-.65$ with mean rent (1940). A similar correspondence obtains in the case of the unemployed.

4. The distributional patterns of Negroes show a definite concentration in areas of relatively low socio-economic status. In fact, the mean coefficients of correlation were slightly higher for 1950 than for 1940. In the case of median income (1950) the mean coefficient was $-.60$ as compared to $-.44$ for mean rent (1940); the mean correlation for median grade completed in 1950 was $-.58$ and in 1940, $-.54$.

5. There is a negative relationship between the percentage of the population classified as males and socio-economic status, but this pattern was less marked in 1950 than in 1940. In the case of median grade the mean of the coefficients for the 20 cities in the primary sample was $-.40$ in 1950 and $-.51$ in 1940. With median income (1950) it was $-.29$ and with mean rent (1940), $-.47$.

6. Concomitant with the numerical decline of the foreign-born white population, a noticeable change has occurred in their spatial patterning. In 1940 the mean of the coefficients of correlation for cities with ten per cent or more foreign-born was $-.63$ and in 1950, $-.32$. In the case of mean rent (1940) the mean of the coefficients was $-.54$ and for median income (1950), $-.16$.

7. Generally, between 1940 and 1950 certain changes have occurred in the ecological patterning of (a) the proportion of the population 60 years and over, (b) the proportion of the population under 15 years of age, and (c) the fertility ratio. In 1940, all but four cities of the 23 showed a tendency for older people (60 years of age and over) to live in higher income areas, whereas in 1950 this pattern was noticeably reversed with 13 cities indicating negative correlations and two, zero correlations. The relationships between the population 60 years and older and median grade completed were similar for both 1940 and 1950. The fertility ratio and the percentage of the population under 15 years are related mathematically and tend to manifest similar patterns. In 1940 the population under 15 years of age showed a

² *Ibid.*

correlation of $-.39$ with mean rent and the corresponding figure for the fertility ratio was $-.47$. In 1950 the coefficients of correlation for these two indices shifted to $+.17$ and $+.12$, respectively. When correlated with median grade completed these two indices showed a negative relationship for both 1940 and 1950, but the coefficients were generally much lower in 1950.

In conclusion, while certain generalizations concerning the significance of socio-economic status in the ecological structure of the American city obtained for both 1940 and 1950, other generalizations seem to reflect increasing variability. It is suggested that further consideration of the socio-economic status aspect of the ecology of the American city might be studied in terms of a series of specific continua rather than on the basis of a single broad dimension. This suggestion should not be construed as inconsistent with the present emphasis on the socio-economic status dimension.

The disassociation of measures pertaining to the foreign-born population, males, fertility, children, and to the older population, from measures of income, occupation, and education indicates possible directions which may be followed in the further analysis of the problem. These changes may reflect the decreasing importance of the foreign-born

population, greater homogeneity of the sex ratio, a movement of older persons to central sections of cities, and a closer relationship between fertility and suburban residence than socio-economic status *per se*. An additional continuum is suggested for the Negro population, which has become associated more closely with the socio-economic cluster of measures. Whether or not such dimensions can be observed in the measures used in this study is unknown. However, this interpretation of the structure of the measures and dimensions is basically consistent with the dimensions of city structure described by Shevky and Tryon and their associates.³

As the next step in attempting to clarify some of the problems raised in this paper, including the possible derivation of additional dimensions pertaining to the ecological structure of the large urban community, the authors are planning to apply factor analysis techniques to the basic data.

³ Eshref Shevky and Marilyn Williams, *The Social Areas of Los Angeles: Analysis and Typology*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949; Eshref Shevky and Wendell Bell, *Social Area Analysis: Theory, Illustrative Application and Computational Procedure*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955; Robert C. Tryon, *Identification of Social Areas by Cluster Analysis*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.

AUTOMATION IN THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY: SOME CONSEQUENCES FOR IN-PLANT SOCIAL STRUCTURE

WILLIAM A. FAUNCE

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology and Labor and Industrial Relations Center,
Michigan State University*

ALTHOUGH study of the work group has always been one of the important concerns of industrial sociologists, the effect of changing production technology upon work groups has received relatively little attention. The currently accelerated rate of technological innovation in American industry provides some unique opportunities for research in this area. This paper reports an attempt to discover the effects of the introduction of automatic transfer machines upon interaction patterns in an auto-

mobile engine plant. The findings of the study are summarized and their implications for some recurrent themes in industrial sociology are considered.

The research upon which the paper is based involved interviews with 125 workers selected randomly from four large machining departments of one of the most highly automated automobile engine plants in Detroit. All of these workers had been transferred to the automated plant from older plants of the same company and about 80 per cent

of them were working in the same job classification in the new as in the older plants. Comparisons could be made therefore between interaction patterns among workers who had performed essentially the same functions under the two kinds of conditions. The workers interviewed had an average of almost 20 years seniority and had been on their automated jobs an average of 15.4 months at the time of the interviews, so it is presumed that they had sufficient experience with both kinds of jobs on which to base such comparisons.

The respondents were asked to compare their *last* previous job in the non-automated plants with their present job with relation to the following areas: (1) size of work group, defined as the number of other workers the respondent thought of as "being in the group that works around you;" (2) size of interaction group, defined as the number of other workers the respondent "talked with most often on the job;" (3) frequency of interaction on the job; (4) the nature of this interaction; and (5) number of jobs involving teamwork, that is, jobs where two or more workers were required to perform the particular operations on the job.

One apparent factor determining the size of interaction groups and the frequency of interaction within these groups in the factory setting is the way in which work stations are spaced along the production line. In the older, non-automated plants in which the respondents had previously worked, machines were spaced on either side of a moving conveyor usually with a worker at each machine. Where the worker was responsible for more than one machine operation, these operations were performed in a circle or "dial" in front of the worker. The average distance between work stations in these plants was somewhat under ten feet. The average size of the work group was about ten employees, with interaction occurring most frequently among the four or five working most closely nearby or directly across from each other on the line. The patterns of interaction were similar to those reported by Walker and Guest, who found interaction occurring most frequently among the two to five workers next to and across from each other on the line and within a

series of overlapping groups along the assembly line.¹ While there were some differences between the findings of this study and those reported by Walker and Guest, resulting primarily from the differences between assembly and machining operations, it seems probable that there are some general characteristics of on-the-job social interaction which are common to mass production industries using conventional assembly or machining procedures.

Work stations being relatively adjacent and many jobs not requiring close and constant attention, social interaction was frequent in the old plants. In response to the question, "Were you able to talk very often to the men around you while you were working?," over 80 per cent of the workers interviewed answered affirmatively. Over 60 per cent of the social contacts reported on these jobs occurred as frequently as once or twice an hour. Interaction was especially frequent on those jobs where more than one worker was required to perform the particular operation and, although a majority of jobs in both the old and the new automated plants did not involve teamwork, there were significantly more such jobs in the old plants ($P < .001$).

Another characteristic of the old jobs which provided opportunity for frequent social interaction was control of work pace by the machine operator. If the worker is able to vary work pace, he is able to create opportunities for social intercourse with others around him on the job. Interaction occurred significantly more frequently among workers who were able to vary work pace and to take a break in both the old non-automated plants and among those workers in the new plant who controlled work pace.

The variables proposed here as having an important effect upon the frequency and nature of social interaction on the job include: (1) amount of attention required by the job, (2) distance between work stations, (3) extent of control of work pace, (4) machine noise, and (5) number of jobs

¹ Charles R. Walker and Robert H. Guest, *The Man on the Assembly Line*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952, pp. 67-72. For a more recent study of an automated plant, see Charles R. Walker, *Toward the Automatic Factory: A Case Study of Men and Machines*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

involving team work. The earlier discussion suggests that the combination of these variables characteristic of production departments using conventional machining techniques permitted frequent social interaction. As a result of the changes in production techniques in the automated plant, this combination of variables changed considerably. Workers reported that automated jobs required much closer and more constant attention than non-automated jobs ($P < .02$). A significantly greater distance between work stations was reported in the new plant, with the average distance between workers being just under twenty feet ($P < .001$). There were fewer jobs in the automated plant where work pace was controlled by the machine operator ($P < .001$). A slightly larger proportion of workers indicated that the automated machines were noisier than non-automated machinery.² Finally, as previously noted, there were significantly fewer jobs in-

TABLE 1. SOCIAL INTERACTION ON THE JOB

	Automated Job (N = 123)	Non-Automated Job (N = 124)
Able to interact often	46.3%	80.6%
Unable to interact often	53.7	19.4
	Chi square = 31.42 P < .001	

volving team work in the automated plant ($P < .001$).

If the variables considered above are important in the structuring of interaction groups in these plants, the possibility follows that there would be less frequent social interaction within smaller groups of workers in the automated plant. The data support this hypothesis. In response to the question, "Are you able to talk very often to the men around you while you are working?", over 80 per cent of the interviewees answered affirmatively with regard to their old job while only about 45 per cent answered affirmatively with reference to their present job in the automated plant.

² While the difference here between the proportions was small, if it represents any increase in machine noise it should be noted that even a slight rise in volume of noise becomes an increasingly effective barrier to communication as the distance between work stations increases.

TABLE 2. FREQUENCY OF SOCIAL INTERACTION ON THE JOB

	Automated Job (N = 117)	Non-Automated Job (N = 119)
Every few minutes or so	18.5%	43.6%
Once or twice an hour	12.6	18.8
Four or five times a day	24.4	23.9
Once a day or less	44.5	13.7
	Chi square = 32.39 P < .001	

There were also significantly fewer social contacts per day reported, with only 18 per cent occurring "every few minutes or so" on automated jobs while over 40 per cent of reported interaction was this frequent on non-automated jobs.

When the data in Table 2 are broken down in terms of size of interaction groups at each level of frequency of interaction, the mean-square contingency coefficient is increased, suggesting that interaction is not only less frequent in the automated plant but occurs among fewer workers. Further evidence that interaction groups are significantly smaller in automated plants is presented in Table 3.

Relationship patterns within these groups also differed in the automated plant. In the old plants each worker along the line characteristically belonged to a somewhat different interaction group than the worker next to him. In the new plant, however, work groups were structured so that the men on each transfer line tended to form a separate and isolated group. In spite of this fact and although there was some interdependence of function among the workers on each transfer line, no feeling of team-

TABLE 3. SIZE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

	Automated Job (N = 120)	Non-Automated Job (N = 115)
Four or fewer in group	79.2%	54.8%
Five or more in group	20.8	45.2
	Chi square = 15.81 P < .001	

work is suggested by the data.³ One explanation for the failure of workers to perceive these groups as "teams," as might be expected under other conditions, is the difficulty in communication within the groups on the job. Because of the impossibility of verbal communication in some sections of automated departments, an elaborate system of sign language had been developed. These hand signals were used primarily for necessary communications about the job, but there were also signs indicating such messages as the time of day and the approach of the foreman or other supervisors, as well as some descriptive gestures used as expressions of opinion of various kinds. Much of the infrequent verbal communication which was reported in the automated departments of the new plant also dealt with the job or with topics necessary for the performance of the job. There was very little of the free interchange regarding non-work matters which appears to have been characteristic of interaction in the older, non-automated plants.

In general, the data suggest that many workers are virtually isolated socially on automated production lines. Under such conditions, it might be expected that fewer close relationships or friendships would develop on the job. Several questions were included in the interview schedule dealing with the number of friendships formed in the automated and non-automated plants. In response to the question, "Would you say you had made more friends on your present job or on your old job?", only 13 per cent of the respondents answered in the affirmative, while 47 per cent reported making more friends on their previous, non-automated job. Of the remaining 40 per cent, who noted no difference between the two jobs in answering this question, a majority responded either that they had "no difficulty making friends any place" or that they were working with the same people in the new plant as on their previous job. In response to another question, almost two and one-half

times as many workers reported that they used to get together socially off the job more often with friends from the old plant than they do now with friends from the new plant. Approximately half of the respondents, however, reported no difference between automated and non-automated jobs in this respect, with most of these indicating that they did not get together socially after working hours with friends from either job. Most workers having been on their last previous, non-automated job for a somewhat longer period and in some instances being co-workers of the same people on their present job as on their previous job, these data should not be interpreted, of course, as evidence that fewer close relationships necessarily develop among workers on automated production lines. The size of the observed differences, however, suggest that further research might show this to be the case.

In addition to alterations in social interaction among workers, automation has produced some shifts in the relations between workers and supervision. The source of these shifts can be traced to changes in the nature of the job of the machine operator. The worker on the automated line is responsible for a larger share of the production process. The job requires more constant and careful attention. The results of failure to attend closely to the job are more costly and, because of the increased complexity of the transfer machinery and the fact that it has only recently been introduced into the automobile industry, machine breakdowns are more frequent in automated departments. These factors play a major role in increasing the amount of supervision of workers on automated jobs. This growth in supervision is accompanied by a reduction in the number of workers per foreman in the new plant as well as an increase in the amount of time spent by the foreman in direct supervision on the line. Both general foremen and superintendents also give more time in the production departments on the line in the automated plant. Tables 4 and 5 show that workers reported significantly more frequent contacts with foremen, general foremen, and superintendents on their present jobs than occurred in the old, non-automated plants.

The data suggest further that there has

³ It is apparently possible in some automated plants to develop teamwork on the job. Friedmann cites the increasing use of production teams in French automated plants to foster cooperation and joint responsibility. G. Friedmann, "Où va le Travail Humain?", *Human Organization*, 13 (1955), pp. 29-33.

TABLE 4. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH FOREMAN

	Automated Job (N = 122)	Non-Automated Job (N = 121)
Very often	40.2%	25.0%
Often	31.1	32.5
Once in awhile, seldom or never	28.7	42.5
Chi square = 7.60 P < .05		

been a change not only in amount of supervision but in the nature of the relationship between workers and first line supervisors. In response to the question, "Would you say it is easier to get along with the foreman on your present job or on your old job?", a larger proportion of workers reported that the relationship had been better on the old job. Moreover, of those who said that they got along better with their foreman in the new, automated plant, 50 per cent listed personal characteristics of the foreman as the principal reason, while fewer than nine per cent cited personal characteristics as a reason for preferring relations with foremen on the old job. In most instances, however, the foremen in the new plant had also been foremen in the old; therefore, this shift in worker-foremen relations is not attributable to personality differences but to a change in the *role* of the foreman in the automated plant.

Most of the foremen in this plant had at one time been machine operators using conventional machining techniques. Most of them also had been foremen for relatively long periods of time. For these reasons, in the non-automated plants, they were apparently able to supervise the older, experienced workers, who comprised the majority of the work force in such plants, with a minimal

use of the authority vested in the foremanship. With the increasing pressures upon the foremen resulting from the change to automated production techniques, however, there has been a change in this pattern of interaction between foremen and workers. The following quotations from interviews suggest the nature of this change:

We have 100 men in the [automated] department and we have five foremen. Before, we had 134 men and one foreman and one assistant. It was better on the old job. Nobody breathing down your neck. Over here it's altogether different, just push, push, push all the time.

They never say hello . . . treat you like a machine. They used to be friendly. Now they seem to be under a strain.

The foremen at the new plant have too much to do and too much responsibility and they get tired and cranky. They'll die of a heart attack yet.

Although no foremen were interviewed in connection with this study, there are indications in the material of some reasons for the increasing pressure upon the foreman on the automated line which may account for the changes in his relationship with workers. The general assignment of the foreman is to see that production schedules are met in the section for which he is responsible. In the older plants, the foreman accomplished this task by making sure that each worker was performing his share of the operation at the required speed and by seeing that machine breakdowns were promptly repaired. On automated lines, however, whatever skill in the exercise of authority a foreman may have acquired is of little avail since the worker does not control the pace of the transfer machine and the production rate is not varied by either the intensity with which the operator watches the machine or the vigor with which he pushes the button. Furthermore, when a machine breakdown occurred in the older, non-automated plants it generally involved only one machine, the line itself usually continued, and repairs could often be made by either the operator or the foreman. When a breakdown occurs on the automatic transfer machines in the new plant, often the whole line stops, as much as a million dollars worth of machinery may be idled while the

TABLE 5. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH GENERAL FOREMAN OR SUPERINTENDENT

	Automated Job (N = 119)	Non-Automated Job (N = 119)
Often	57.2%	36.1%
Once in awhile	27.7	35.3
Seldom or never	15.1	28.6
Chi square = 11.64 P < .01		

repairs are made, and neither the foreman nor the operator has the requisite skills to make many of the necessary repairs. Thus the foreman in the automated plant is faced with meeting increased production schedules without being able to utilize effectively either his acquired "human relations" skills or the knowledge he has accumulated about conventional machining processes. The resulting tensions have, it seems, produced changes in his relations with workers. Although further research would be necessary to document the specific nature of these changes, the data suggest that there have been significant changes in the role of the foreman on the automated line.

Before considering the implications of these findings for common themes in industrial sociology, certain analytic problems posed by the nature of the research design of this study should be noted. The respondents were asked to compare past with present experiences; therefore there is the possibility of distortions of recall. This paper is concerned, however, not primarily with the attitudes of workers toward the change, but with the nature of the change itself. Thus less selectivity of recall might be expected. It may be added that there were less than two years in each instance since the workers' last experience with non-automated jobs and that there was little noticeable difficulty in recall in responding to questions about these jobs.

The fact that all of the workers had previously been employed in non-automated plants might be expected to affect the findings of the study, although this result is perhaps less the case when a description rather than an evaluation of change is requested. The larger study from which this paper is taken, however, analyzes not only the nature of the change but individual and organizational adjustments to changes in production technology as well; hence the necessity here to consider workers who had experienced the shift from the older type of plant to automation.⁴

The possibility that some of the differences associated with automation may be

attributed to the relative newness of the technology rather than the pattern of technology as such should be recognized. For example, the workers' failure to identify with specific work groups and their perception of changes in supervisory style of foremen may be the result of the disruption of established patterns not as yet replaced. While the variation in amount of experience with automation was limited among workers in the study, no appreciable differences were found between the responses of workers who had been in the new plant throughout the two year period during which it had been in operation and of those who had more recently transferred to the plant. The question of which of the specific changes in the social structure of the new plant can be attributed to automatic technology and which to the "disequilibrium" in the situation during the period of change can be best answered through further research.⁵

If the changes in social structure in this plant are at all representative of the effects of automation elsewhere and if the current rate of introduction of automated machinery into American industry increases, the findings reported here may have important implications for certain recurrent themes in industrial sociology. One of these is illustrated by the persistent effort to relate diverse social and psychological variables to the productivity of work groups. For example, there have been numerous attempts in studies of human relations in industry to establish interconnections between work group morale and its productivity. Apart from the questionable assumption that increasing output is necessarily a goal of industrial work groups,⁶ the findings of the present investigation raise the additional question of the applicability of such studies to automated industries. The "morale" of the oper-

⁵ A second study of this plant is planned in connection with the Automation Research Project of the Labor and Industrial Relations Center at Michigan State University.

⁶ Some studies have demonstrated that group cohesiveness and morale may also be effective in subverting management objectives and restricting output. See, e.g., D. Roy, "Quota Restriction and Goldbricking in a Machine Shop," *American Journal of Sociology*, 57 (1952), pp. 427-442; D. Collins, M. Dalton, and D. Roy, "Restriction of Output and Social Cleavage in Industry," *Applied Anthropology*, 5 (1946), pp. 1-14.

⁴ See William A. Faunce, "Automation in the Automobile Industry: Some Consequences for In-Plant and Union-Management Relationships," Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1957.

ator who pushes a button that starts the operation of a transfer machine has no effect whatsoever upon the rate of production of that machine. Where work pace is no longer controlled by the worker, man-hour productivity becomes a meaningless measure of achievement of group goals even where cohesive work groups exist and where they are identified with the organization to the degree that output is accepted as a goal of such groups.

Study of the effects of style of leadership upon cohesiveness of work groups and upon output constitutes another recurrent theme in industrial sociology. While "output" of machine repairmen, bench hands or other workers not directly involved in the production process may be affected by style of leadership, for the majority of workers in the automated plant, who do not control work pace, the manner of leadership does not affect productivity. In situations where the nature of the machine process effectively prevents social interaction, moreover, variations in leadership style cannot be regarded as a significant factor affecting cohesiveness of work groups. In most studies of effects of leadership upon informal social structure, type of leadership has been treated as an independent variable. In the analysis of the foreman's relationship with the work group or groups for which he is responsible, however, the question of the effect of the nature of group structure upon the role of the foreman may be equally important. The situation which characterized the pre-automation plants in this study, where the foreman was apparently integrated into cohesive work groups, may make appropriate a style of leadership which is neither possible nor appropriate in the automated plant, given changes in informal social structure of the kind described above. Further study of the changing role of the foreman in automated industries is needed, and such research should include analysis of the extent to which changes in *group structure* affect leadership style.

A series of related studies in industrial sociology rest upon the assumption of relatively cohesive work groups. It is assumed, for example, that primary relations are more

likely to develop in smaller groups in investigations of the effect of size of work group upon job satisfaction, regular attendance, or industrial peace. Similarly, the study of the degree of identification of work group members with the larger organization and its goals assumes such identification to be a group product. A third illustration is the analysis of the extent of diffusion of authority in an organization where there is concern for work group participation in decision-making, for autonomy of work groups, or for "self-determination" by work groups. The conception of the work group in these and similar studies incorporates the view that active involvement of the members of the group in group processes, identification with a particular group, and opportunity for frequent interaction within the group are present. While such a conception may be appropriate in some industrial settings, it is clearly inappropriate when applied to the automated automobile engine plant. The workers in this plant were able to identify a certain number of people with whom they worked, but the work group thus identified was defined almost exclusively in terms of spatial proximity or similarity of function. Where groups are conceived in this way and not as interaction systems, the assumption that morale, determination of goals, or decision-making in general will emerge as *group* products is a tenuous one.

Sometimes the term work group has been loosely applied in industrial sociology to any small functionally interdependent collectivity of workers. Changes in informal social structure resulting from automation point to the necessity for a more rigorous definition of the work group concept and to the need for caution in the application of the concept in analysis of the consequences of group activity. Many of the working concepts in industrial sociology have been developed in the study of "human relations in industry" and are oriented to interactional patterns in the "small group." The effects of automation upon social structure in the workplace suggest that a broader conceptualization of industrial social systems may be required.

RANDOMIZATION AND INFERENCE IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

ROBERT MCGINNIS

*The University of Wisconsin**

AN accusing finger has been leveled at those of us who test survey research data for statistical significance. In a recent paper Professor Hanan C. Selvin concludes that "... conditions under which tests of significance may validly be used are almost impossible of fulfillment in sociological research. . . ."¹ If his critical appraisal causes sociologists to re-examine their research procedures, Selvin will be due a great deal of credit. But, if some are convinced that his conclusion is correct, and if they act accordingly, the results could be disastrous for quantitative sociology. Selvin arrived at this conclusion by reasoning that "... tests of statistical significance are inapplicable in nonexperimental research."² Now most sociological research is nonexperimental and more often than not it involves probability sampling from some population. Thus, the door is opened to the possibility of making statistical inferences. In this light, Selvin's charges certainly merit the most careful consideration.

This paper contains an analysis of Selvin's position and presents some of the arguments against it.³ It is not meant to be a philippic, but is concerned almost exclusively with an evaluation of his claims. Specifically, it is contended that the statements quoted above are false and that the stated reasons for making them have nothing to do with statistical tests of significance.

* This paper was prepared while the author was a Visiting Research Fellow, Department of Statistics, University of California, under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council.

¹ Hanan C. Selvin, "A Critique of Tests of Significance in Survey Research," *American Sociological Review*, 22 (October, 1957), p. 520.

² *Ibid.* p. 527.

³ For additional critical comments, see letters to the editor by David Gold and James Besbers in the *American Sociological Review*, 23 (February and April, 1958), pp. 85-86, 199.

THE REASONS AGAINST

Professor Selvin marshals several reasons against the use of significance tests in sociological research. These are divided into two categories which he calls problems of design and problems of interpretation. The principal problems of design are, first, that randomization usually is impossible in the assignment of subjects to experimental and control groups in social research and, second, that sociologists often have no "... stimulus or set of treatments to be administered to one group and withheld from the other."⁴ The second of these two reasons for disallowing statistical tests in social research is actually very little different from the first. It refers to the fact that subjects are assigned by "nature" to classes of most variables which interest sociologists. Its importance evidently rests in the fact that this natural assignment prevents the investigator from randomizing. The critical problem for sociologists, then, in Selvin's view, rests in the fact that the experimental procedure of randomization is impossible in most of their research.

Problems of interpretation which Selvin cites include the confusion of statistical significance with substantive importance, problems of interpreting random errors, and the sin of a *posteriori* selection of hypotheses to be tested. Such problems of interpretation, or more properly of misinterpretation, are real and important, and Selvin's discussion of them is a genuine contribution. But they have nothing whatsoever to do with the admissibility of significance tests in sociological research. Misinterpretation of the results of statistical analyses is a mark of naiveté, but not necessarily of improper statistical procedures. Surely Professor Selvin would not

⁴ Selvin, *op. cit.*, p. 521.

have us abandon a valuable set of research tools because some of those who apply them make a very poor job of it. These commonplace abuses are not considered in this paper.

It is clear that the act of randomization plays a crucial part in Selvin's argument. Thus, to understand his position it is necessary to have some knowledge of the effects of randomization and of the possible consequences of failure to randomize. These effects are illustrated in the following section, after which it is contended that Professor Selvin's main conclusion, namely that tests of significance are inadmissible in social research, is incorrect.

THE MATHEMATICS OF RANDOMIZATION

The process and consequences of randomization are considered here only with relation to the simplest possible situation, that of a continuous dependent variable, a dichotomous independent variable, and one dichotomous confounding factor.⁵ We consider only the problem of testing a simple hypothesis about the difference between two population mean values, but the discussion applies quite generally to tests of hypotheses about parameters of almost any form. Although Selvin does not mention estimation procedures, the following remarks apply to statistical estimation as well as to tests of hypotheses.

In the illustration below it is supposed that there exists one variable only, the so-called confounding factor, which is related jointly to the independent and to the dependent variables. With this assumption in mind it is supposed that mean values of the dependent variable are found to differ between the two classes of the independent variable, but that these differences vanish within the two sub-classes of the confounding variable. This is the situation that trou-

bles Selvin. Under these conditions he would assert that the obtained difference between means in the two independent classes is meaningless or spurious. For this reason we ask what it is that gives rise to the difference.

In the following paragraphs it is shown that the difference between means of the two independent variable classes is a function of two parameters, labeled α and β . The first of these is found to be a measure of association between the confounding factor and the independent variable and the second is found to be a measure of association between the confounding factor and the dependent variable. These parameters are such that whenever either takes the value zero, the difference between means of the independent classes also becomes zero. Finally, it is shown that the process of randomization has the effect of setting the first parameter equal to zero. These two parameters are the crux of the matter. Should they be viewed as real and meaningful components to be investigated, or merely as nuisance effects to be eliminated in the research design? Evidently Selvin would take the latter view. It is contended later that such a position is entirely unsatisfactory in social research.

To establish the necessary structure, let X represent an independent variable which is divided into classes X_1 and X_2 . Let Y be a continuous variable and let Z be a variable which is divided into Z_1 and Z_2 . Nine different population mean values of Y , to be noted μ , can be defined if the population is classified with respect to X and Z . These are displayed in Table 1. Let N_{ij} ($i, j=1, 2$) be the number of subjects in the population which are in both classes Z_i and X_j . Let $N_{i.}$ be the (marginal) number of cases in class Z_i and $N_{.j}$ be the number in class X_j . Also let $N=N_{1.}+N_{2.}=N_{.1}+N_{.2}$.

TABLE 1. NINE MEAN VALUES OF VARIABLE Y

	X_1	X_2	
Z_1	μ_{11}	μ_{12}	$\mu_{1.}$
Z_2	μ_{21}	μ_{22}	$\mu_{2.}$
	$\mu_{.1}$	$\mu_{.2}$	μ_y

Since X is the independent variable of the problem, the hypothesis to be tested, in null

⁵ The terms dependent and independent are meant to connote nothing about cause and effect. They reflect only the direction of analysis which interests the researcher. By a confounding factor is meant any variable whose distribution is statistically independent of neither the dependent nor the independent variable. For a discussion and bibliography on randomization, see Oscar Kempthorne, "The Randomization Theory of Experimental Inference," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 50 (September, 1955), pp. 946-67.

form and in the notation of Table 1, is the following:

$$H: \mu_{.1} = \mu_{.2} (= \mu_z) \quad (1)$$

Note that the variable Z plays no explicit part in the hypothesis. It might seem that the following is an equivalent hypothesis:

$$H: \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} (= \mu_{1.}) \text{ and } \mu_{21} = \mu_{22} (= \mu_{2.}) \quad (2)$$

It is not true, however, that (1) always implies or is implied by (2). In fact whenever (2) is true (1) is also true if and only if at least one of two conditions is satisfied.⁶

These are:

$$\text{Condition (A) } \mu_{1.} = \mu_{2.} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Condition (B) } N_{11}N_{22} = N_{12}N_{21} \quad (4)$$

Condition (A) is implied by statistical independence of variables Y and Z. Condition (B) both implies and is implied by statistical independence of variables X and Z. Whenever neither condition is satisfied and (2) is true, then (1) must be false. In such a situation the following important question is raised: if variables X and Y are unrelated within classes of variable Z, is there any "true" difference between $\mu_{.1}$ and $\mu_{.2}$, or is the apparent difference wholly spurious? It is Selvin's implicit negative answer to this question which underlies his entire argument.

The relations described above can be summarized with the aid of two definitions. Let

$$\alpha = \left| \frac{N}{N_{.1}N_{.2}} [N_{ij} - \frac{1}{N} (N_{i.}N_{.j})] \right| \quad (i, j = 1, 2) \quad (5)$$

which is known to be unique over all i, j in any four-celled table. Let

$$\beta = |\mu_{.1} - \mu_{.2}| \quad (6)$$

With these definitions it can be demonstrated that, if (2) is true, then

$$|\mu_{.1} - \mu_{.2}| = \alpha\beta \quad (7)$$

and that if the row-wise variances, say $\sigma_{1.}^2$ and $\sigma_{2.}^2$ are such that

$$\sigma_{1.}^2 = \sigma_{2.}^2 = \sigma_z^2 \quad (8)$$

then the overall variance, say σ_y^2 is given by

$$\sigma_y^2 = \sigma_z^2 + \frac{N_{1.}N_{2.}\beta^2}{N^2} \quad (9)$$

Clearly, whenever (3) is satisfied, $\beta=0$ and whenever (4) is satisfied, $\alpha=0$. Thus, by (7),

⁶ Proofs are omitted throughout this paper, but are available upon request.

whenever either condition is satisfied, and (2) is true, the major hypothesis, $H: \mu_{.1} = \mu_{.2}$ also is true. Moreover, whenever these conditions obtain, the overall variance is equal to either of the homogeneous row-wise variances, as is seen by (9). Now we are in a position to assess the influence of randomization.

The physical process of randomization consists of assigning subjects to classes of the independent variable (X_1 and X_2 in the illustration) by some random process. This act therefore generates a random variable so that we can consider expected or average values of the two terms in (4).⁷ Randomization has the effect of setting the two expectations equal, that is, $E(N_{11}N_{22}) = E(N_{12}N_{21})$. It follows from this that (4) is always satisfied after randomization except for random fluctuations so that the value of α becomes approximately 0. In this way, whenever (2) is true, (1) is also true within the limits of random fluctuation. This process then has the effect of eliminating the need to consider the question raised above about spurious differences.

In a situation where condition (A) is not satisfied with respect to X and all variables Z, the association between X and Z is sometimes called correlated bias. Failure to eliminate this effect is at the heart of Selvin's argument, illustrated by his claim that "... only when all important correlated biases have been controlled is it legitimate to measure the possible influence of random errors by statistical tests of significance.⁸ The force of this assertion may be illustrated by the following situation.

Suppose that in some population there are three variables, X, Y, Z, which conform to the conditions of Table 1 and for which neither of the conditions of (3) and (4) is satisfied.⁹ Suppose also that (2) is true for these three variables. In this population then, variables X and Y are independent among the subgroup Z_1 and the subgroup Z_2 , but,

⁷ For a discussion of random variables and expectations, see William Feller, *Probability Theory and Its Applications*, Vol. I, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1950, Chapter 9.

⁸ Selvin, *op. cit.*, p. 521. Original in italics.

⁹ For simplicity, suppose that for all other variables, U, condition (B) is satisfied for X and U. In this way statistical control of variable Z would be completely equivalent to randomization.

when the two groups are combined this independence is lost.

Suppose that two investigators are unaware of these facts and that each independently sets out to test the hypothesis that there is no difference in the two means μ_1 and μ_2 . Imagine that both draw random samples from the population and that they happen to select exactly the same set of subjects. Suppose that the first investigator elects to control the correlation of variables X and Z, which is the equivalent of randomization with respect to this one confounding effect, but that the second fails to do this. Then despite the fact that both observed the same subjects, they drew random samples from two quite different populations. In the population of the first investigator the hypothesis H: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ is true and the variable Y has variance $\sigma_y^2 = \sigma_0^2$. In the second investigator's population the hypothesis is false, as is seen by (7) and the variable Y has variance $\sigma_y^2 = \sigma_0^2 + \frac{N_1 N_2 \beta^2}{N^2}$.

The first researcher would probably be led to accept the null hypothesis while the second probably would be led to reject it. All of these differences are attributable solely to the fact that the first investigator controlled the correlated bias of variables X and Z while the second did not.

Now Selvin would have us ask which of the two procedures is correct, implying that one is not. He has already given us his answer. He would evidently contend that the procedure of the first investigator is correct while that of the second is in serious error. The claim here is that *neither* procedure is incorrect, that the basic error is made by those who ask the question in the first place.

Selvin's confusion stems mainly from the failure to recognize that there are different classes of hypotheses. Classifications based on the number of parameters under consideration, directionality and the like are ignored in this discussion. Rather, a three-level classification based on the *conditionality* of empirical hypotheses is used. To establish this classification one definition is added to the notation already developed. Let γ represent any parameter of a distribution function. In the preceding sections, γ would be the difference between two means, $\mu_1 - \mu_2$. Then three classes of hypotheses

about γ can be considered. In null form these are:

Type I H: $\gamma = 0$

Type II H: $\gamma = 0 \mid (a_i \beta_i) = 0 \text{ for } X, Y, \text{ and certain } Z_i (i=1, 2, \dots, N)$

Type III H: $\gamma = 0 \mid (a_i \beta_i) = 0 \text{ for } X, Y, \text{ and all } Z_i (i=1, 2, \dots)$

The first type might be called an *absolute hypothesis* in that no conditions are established regarding the relation of the variables under consideration to any others. A Type II hypothesis might be termed *finitely conditional* since a condition of statistical independence is required between variables X, Y and a finite number of other variables, Z_i , if the hypothesis is to be true. Similarly, hypotheses of the third type might be called *infinitely conditional* in that conditions are specified for the variables X, Y and an infinite number of variables Z_i . With these definitions, we can proceed to an appraisal of Selvin's claims.

REASONS AGAINST THE REASONS AGAINST

At the outset note should be made of what amounts to a grossly misleading passage in Professor Selvin's discussion. In an attempt to formulate a statement of research objectives, he writes the following: "... in most sociological research . . . the population sampled is chosen because it is convenient; the emphasis is on explanation rather than description, on uncovering general relationships rather than precisely depicting a unique situation."¹⁰ It is doubtful that he believes this generalization to be literally true, so we must view the passage as an unfortunate choice of terms. But, the statement as it stands implies that if a relation is found to obtain after randomization in one population, then it must obtain in all populations. This, of course, does not hold. Any population can be viewed as an element in the field of sets generated by the set of all possible elements.¹¹ The fact that a relation obtains

¹⁰ Selvin, *op. cit.*, p. 520.

¹¹ For example, the set of all persons now living in the United States is an element in the field induced by the set of all creatures ever having lived on earth. For a discussion of fields and sample spaces, see Harold Cramér, *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946, Chapter 1, especially Section 1.6.

in one set implies that it obtains in all others only if XYZ correlations are identical for X, Y and all variables Z in all sets. Since this is hardly ever the case, it is not true that one can uncover "general" relationships by examining some arbitrarily selected population. Undoubtedly Selvin recognizes these facts, but his use of the terms "explanation," "description," "general" and "unique" could easily mislead some readers. There is no such thing as a completely general relationship which is independent of population, time, and space. The extent to which a relationship is constant among different populations is an empirical question which can be resolved only by examining different populations at different times in different places.

Selvin's statement of research goals bears careful examination for another reason. Although the terms are cloudy in the extreme, it is fairly evident that by "description" is meant the process of testing a Type I hypothesis, while "explanation" refers to a test of a Type III hypothesis. The former asserts only that a set of parameters, γ , have equal values. The latter asserts that this equality holds even after all correlated biases have been removed. In Selvin's view, "explanation" rather than mere "description" is our cup of tea. From the lack of restrictions placed on these terms, one could almost claim that the task he sees for social scientists is to uncover the eternal verities.

Selvin may not have such a large order in mind, to be sure, but the job which he prescribes for social researchers nonetheless is one of overwhelming proportions. For it seems to be his belief that social scientists should be concerned immediately and exclusively with Type III hypotheses and their tests. This conviction leads Selvin to the conclusion that *all* hypotheses of sociology are automatically of Type III.

This mistaken impression is illustrated by Selvin's consideration of the hypothesis that "... urban residents have a higher level of political interest than do rural residents."¹² Note that this is a Type I hypothesis since no conditions are imposed on the relationship of the two variables to any others. Selvin supposes that adequate measures of these

two variables are at hand and that appropriate samples have been drawn at random from the two defined populations. Should an investigator then attempt to test the hypothesis by statistical inference, Selvin would object because of failure to control the correlated bias of such variables as education and income. "Where so many factors are uncontrolled it is obviously impossible to say that political interest *depends only* on place of residence and random variables."¹³ Obviously impossible, yes, but this is not what the investigator sets out to do in the first place. At the outset a Type I hypothesis is to be tested. As the illustration proceeds, however, Selvin transforms it into one of Type III and then takes the researcher to task for failing to satisfy the necessary conditions. Here is clear evidence of failure to recognize the distinctions between these hypothetical types.

It is this failure which generates the major fallacy of Professor Selvin's paper. We are told that it is "legitimate" to use tests of significance only after all correlated bias has been removed. If by legitimate is meant conformity to the assumptions of a statistical test, this statement is incorrect. Moreover, the argument at this point does not, in fact, apply to statistical test procedures.

All statistical tests require that certain conditions be satisfied if they are to be used legitimately. Some of these conditions concern the form of frequency distributions and the manner in which observations are made; others are imposed by the statement of the hypothesis under test. Whatever the hypothesis, some statistical models require that distribution functions be continuous and normally distributed. Other models make different demands. Regardless of the test statistic, some hypotheses demand that certain correlated biases be controlled, others do not. Only Type III hypotheses impose the condition that *all* correlated biases be controlled, which can be accomplished only by randomization. Type II hypotheses require that some finite number of related effects be eliminated, presumably in the statistical model itself. Type I hypotheses make no demands whatsoever of this sort.

¹² Selvin, *op. cit.*, p. 521.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 522. Italics mine.

No test of significance requires *of itself* that all correlated biases be removed, that is, that randomization be effected. It is true that this process assures that some requisite conditions of certain test statistics will be reasonably well met. Failure to randomize, however, in no way assures that such conditions will be violated. In general, then, the claim that all statistical tests of all hypotheses require the experimental procedure of randomization is unwarranted.

These considerations show that Selvin's assertion about legitimate applications of tests of significance is incorrect. They also show the reasons for his claim. Selvin insists that Type III interpretations be made of *all* verified hypotheses; and his statement is concerned exclusively with interpretations. Thus, the innocent test of significance becomes a false villain.

This situation becomes even more clear when it is recognized that there is only one difference between testing an hypothesis by observing an entire population and by drawing a sample, observing it and making inferences to the population. In either case, acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis is made according to some prearranged decision procedure. In the former instance a correct decision is made with certainty, in the latter with probability less than one.¹⁴ A statistical test of significance tells nothing more than the probability of making errors in the decision given that certain conditions obtain. If correlated biases are present in the population, they influence the outcome of the test whether or not the population is sampled or enumerated. If Selvin's researcher had enumerated his rural and urban populations rather than sampling them, or if he had used no tests of significance, the problem would not have been altered. So long as he did not randomize, it would be impossible in either case for him to conclude that political interest depended solely on place of residence and random variables.¹⁵

Apart from this unwarranted assertion,

the tone of his paper suggests that Selvin would still refuse or be reluctant to allow the use of statistical test procedures in most sociological research. This reluctance seems to stem from the view that the only worthwhile hypotheses are those of the third type. There is little doubt that Selvin advocates a sociology of cause and effect. Few would dispute that this is a desirable goal. The latter does not justify the insistence, however, that all researchers restrict their attention to testable Type III hypotheses. What would be the consequences of such a restriction?

One consequence is clear: most social researchers would soon be out of business. Since randomization is required to test a Type III hypothesis and since this is usually impossible in sociology, the business slump would follow swiftly and inevitably. A second consequence, assuming that some hypotheses of this sort could be tested, would be a major increase in interpretive power. Rather than concentrating on correlations, we could at least begin to interpret relations, with all due caution of course, in terms of cause and effect. Such a result would be valuable, of course, but this does not deny the considerable value of "descriptive" knowledge.

This less potent form of knowledge is useful for at least two reasons. First, the more exhaustive the descriptive knowledge which theorists have at hand, the sounder the basis for the construction of general theory—theory which eventually might yield testable hypotheses of the third type. A second utility of testing nonconditional hypotheses is that the practice yields at least partially satisfactory bases for prediction. In fact, a test of a Type I hypothesis may sometimes contribute considerably more to accurate short-range prediction than would a test of a Type III hypothesis. For example, from an explanatory point of view, it is imperative to understand that racial differences in measured intelligence tend to diminish or to disappear altogether as one increases the number of variables whose correlated effects are controlled. We know, however, that because of the effects of these many variables, there are sometimes considerable differences among races in measured intelligence. For purposes of prediction and policy formation, who

¹⁴ This assumes that no errors are made in observation, recording, computation, and so on.

¹⁵ This is not to say that randomization is sufficient to permit legitimate imputations of cause and effect. Problems of temporal paths of cause as well as epistemological questions would have to be settled first.

would maintain that such knowledge is trivial?¹⁶

We contend, therefore, that a sociologist performs a valuable service whenever he investigates relationships among sociologically important variables, even though he is able to establish only the most paltry number of controls. So long as his design is as carefully constructed as possible, his measurements as accurate as instruments permit, and his interpretations no broader than the data and test procedures warrant, he is performing a worthwhile service.

If Selvin had said no more than that randomization is desirable in sociological research, we should have concurred enthusiastically. Had he made fresh, useful suggestions toward this end, these would have been a most welcome contribution. Since none was made, we may ask what would Selvin have us do? The answer is not to be found in his paper. The less stringent position advocated here, on the other hand, seems to have some suggestions. The elementary facts noted above have at least a few implications for action.

The first of these may be phrased as follows: where randomization is impossible, seek to maximize statistical controls. We have depicted three classes of hypotheses, including those of the second type which require control of a finite number of variables. By employing appropriate statistical devices it is possible to control the correlated bias of a number of related variables. Partial correlation coefficients and the analysis of covariance are examples of such devices.¹⁷ As

¹⁶In this connection it should be noted that Type II hypotheses have a value which is afforded by those of neither Type I nor Type III. Since tests of Type II hypotheses require that subjects be classified with respect to all variables under consideration, joint frequency distributions result which give information, often extremely important, about interactions at all levels among the variables.

¹⁷Control features also are available for use with

the number of tested Type II hypotheses is increased and as more and more variables are brought under control in each test, we shall come to an ever more satisfactory approximation of Selvin's "explanatory knowledge."

We recognize with Professor Selvin the difficulty of putting this dictum into effect. He observes that thousands of cases may be required to control the merest handful of related variables. This is undeniably the case, at least when a simple random sampling plan is used to locate the cases. Multiphase sampling, however, in which the population or a large areal sample is prelisted with respect to control variables, can greatly reduce the necessary number of cases. The judicious selection of control variables and the use of more sophisticated sampling plans can add immeasurably to the strength of sociological research.

Even where these suggestions are carried out, there remains the problem of selecting appropriate statistical tests. Many of these models are based upon assumptions which are not tenable with respect to most sociological variables. All too few of our variables are known to be continuous, for example, and to possess workable distribution functions. This remains a serious problem despite the encouraging progress of theoretical statisticians in the area of non-parametric statistics. Perhaps, then, sociologists would be wise to devote more of their attention to problems of measurement and standardization, even if this means that less time can be devoted to testing complicated hypotheses. Only when we have measuring instruments with more powerful scaling properties than ordinality can we make use of the most effective statistical tools to control correlated bias.

some non-continuous variables. See for example M. Ezekiel, *Methods of Correlation Analysis*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1941, Chapter 17.

RESEARCH REPORTS AND NOTES

"BUREAUCRATIC" ELEMENTS IN ORGANIZATIONS: SOME RESEARCH FINDINGS

STANLEY UDY, Jr.
Yale University

During the course of a general comparative study of work organization in nonindustrial society, the data under analysis quite unexpectedly yielded a highly consistent pattern of relationships between certain "bureaucratic" organizational characteristics.¹ If these relationships prove to have general validity, they imply a possibly highly fruitful reformulation of the Weberian model of "rational bureaucracy." Therefore they are presented here, despite the small number of cases on which they are based and the peripheral, "accidental" nature of the findings.

The analysis is based on 25 examples of bureaucratic production organizations in 19 different societies, using data collected from the Human Relations Area Files, supplemented by additional ethnographic materials. The 25 cases utilized here represent a portion of a larger sample of 321 nonindustrial production organizations, used in the broader study referred to above. Owing to gaps in the data, as well as to the fact that bureaucracy is in any case fairly rare in nonindustrial production systems, only 38 of the original 321 cases could be definitely classified as bureaucratic according to criteria which we shall presently discuss. And only 25 of these 38 examples offered sufficiently complete data on all relevant points to enable their use in the present analysis. For these reasons, as well as those noted above, our conclusions may be regarded as no more than suggestive.

A *production organization* is defined here as any social group oriented to the combination or transformation of raw materials into material goods. Such an organization is designated as *bureaucratic* if it possesses three or more levels of authority such that all members on one level are subordinate to one or more members on the next higher level, and so on until the top-most level is reached. This definition departs

from conventional usage in specifying only one, rather than several, distinguishing characteristics. Such a procedure involves no assumption of simultaneous covariation of several diverse elements, and hence, we believe, avoids "ideal-type" rigidity. Operationally, production organizations were classified as bureaucratic or otherwise by reconstructing organization charts from ethnographic materials and counting the number of authority levels.

This minimal definition further permits us to treat the presence or absence of other purported "bureaucratic" attributes as a purely empirical question. In the present report, we are concerned with four such frequently cited attributes: specialized division of labor, segmental participation of members, "compensatory" rewards, and an emphasis on performance. Division of labor is considered *specialized* if three or more qualitatively different operations are carried on concurrently by different members. Participation of members is deemed *segmental* if its terms are defined by some explicit contractual agreement. Rewards are said to be *compensatory* if money or goods in kind are allocated by higher authority to members of lower authority in return for participation. A *performance emphasis* is considered to be present if the quantity of the reward, whether allocated by a compensatory system or otherwise, is expected in any respect whatever to be proportional to the amount of work done, the amount of effort expended, or both.²

The presence or absence of each of these attributes in each of our 25 cases had previously been determined from ethnographic descriptions as part of the larger project. Initial examination of this information revealed that

² These attributes were adapted from specifications alleged by Max Weber in various parts of his work to apply to "rational bureaucracy." They are not, however, necessarily those specifications conventionally cited in this connection, nor are they intended to exhaust all those given by him. See his *Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947, pp. 225-226; *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 196ff.; *General Economic History*, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950, p. 95.

¹ See the writer's unpublished doctoral dissertation, *The Organization of Production in Nonindustrial Culture*, Princeton University, 1958.

not every bureaucratic organization possesses all four, or even any, of these characteristics. This fact is hardly surprising, especially in view of the type of organizations studied. However, if we arrange these 25 cases, starting with those possessing all four attributes and proceeding to those possessing none of them, the resulting array forms a scale, with only one exceptional case, as indicated by Table 1.

In Table 1, X denotes the presence of an attribute, and O, its absence. An asterisk (*) indicates some ambiguity leading to certain difficulties of classification, the nature of which will be explained presently. Roman numerals indicate either alternative ways of organizing the same activity, or the presence of different organizational forms at different stages of the process. Each entry corresponds to a single instance of work organization reported in the literature; the forms indicated in no sense purport to be exhaustive of all ways in which the activity in question may be carried on in the society concerned.

One of the major difficulties of any comparative institutional analysis of this sort is the problem of classifying concrete examples according to precise abstract criteria where institutionalization is, in reality, quite flexible and diffuse. As explained above, only cases involving what appear to be precise descriptions of the status of the four attributes under analysis were used in the study. But where the data clearly indicate diffuse or uncertain institutionalization of any of the four attributes under study, we have reported the case as "ambiguous." The data themselves are not ambiguous; but institutionalization is reported as being so. The interesting fact in this connection is that none of these ambiguities appear to be inconsistent with the scale suggested by our array. Rather, the question in each instance seems to be the precise point at which the example should appear on the scale. In the case of Kabyle construction I, for example, there is no doubt about the presence of compensatory rewards and specialization. For the majority of positions, there is likewise some emphasis on performance. It appears, however, that in most cases an individual building a house hires a mason under a rather explicit contractual agreement. To this extent, segmental participation is institutionalized, but can hardly be said to be general to the entire organization. Thus in a sense our classification of this case is somewhat arbitrary: compensatory rewards and specialization are present, a performance emphasis is widespread but not universal, while segmental participation seems to be restricted to one position only. The point is that despite this ambiguity, and regardless of which "cutoff

point" one prefers, the case remains consistent with the alleged general model.³

Our other ambiguous cases are similar. In construction among the Solomon Islanders, compensatory rewards and specialization are present generally, but a "master builder" is likely to be engaged, with some performance emphasis and segmental participation on his part. Dahomean agriculture may at times involve specialization, in addition to compensatory rewards. Iroquois agriculture does not appear to involve specialization strictly according to our definition, but each person on the authority level next to the top is held responsible for a certain part of the field. In Southeastern Bantu agriculture II (a corvée for the chief), there is some indication that the chief frequently provides a feast for the workers, i.e., a compensatory reward. On the other hand, there appear to be instances where the chief does not do so, but commands the work simply by virtue of his authority. An analogous situation seems to obtain in Tibetan agriculture: a feast is sometimes provided, although in general contributions to the lord of the manor are required by virtue of the latter's authority position.⁴ In the Basuto hunting example, distribution of rewards seems not to be compensatory; hunters are required to make contributions to higher authority. Some redistribution may take place, however, and generally does indirectly, in that each hunter is allowed to keep much of his own game.

None of the ambiguities reported, then, is inconsistent with the scale suggested by our array. Although the problem of spurious accuracy may remain present in other respects, it is significant that the suggested model does not appear to stand or fall on the question of diffuse institutionalization.

If the pattern suggested by our data is generally valid, it has some far-reaching implications. It suggests, for example, that in order for segmental participation to be institutionalized in any bureaucratic production organization, performance emphasis, specialized division of labor, and compensatory rewards must also be institutionalized. It similarly suggests an order in which different characteristics must be introduced in the course of organizational development under conditions where they cannot be

³ Rene Maunier, *La Construction collective de la Maison en Kabylie*, Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie, 1926. Similarly, for the other cases described below, see the references cited in Table 1.

⁴ Provision of a feast, however, may extend only to instances of intra-village reciprocity, and thus may belong to a different organizational form from the one reported here. See David MacDonald, *The Land of the Lama*, London: Seeley Service and Co., 1929, p. 240.

TABLE 1. BUREAUCRATIC ELEMENTS IN TWENTY-FIVE NONINDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION ORGANIZATIONS

Society	Activity	Segmental participation	Performance emphasis	Specialization	Compensatory rewards
Navaho ¹	hunting I	X	X	X	X
Navaho ¹	hunting II	X	X	X	X
Paiute ²	hunting	X	X	X	X
Sanpoil ³	hunting	X	X	X	X
Lobi ⁴	construction I	X	X	X	X
Kabyles ⁵	construction I*	O	X	X	X
Betsileo ⁶	agriculture	O	O	X	X
Haitians ⁷	agriculture	O	O	X	X
Lobi ⁸	hunting	O	O	X	X
Kabyles ⁵	construction II	O	O	X	X
Solomon Islanders ⁹	construction *	O	O	X	X
Bantu (southeast) ¹⁰	agriculture I	O	O	O	X
Bemba ¹¹	agriculture I	O	O	O	X
Bemba ¹¹	agriculture II	O	O	O	X
Dahomey ¹²	agriculture *	O	O	O	X
Hopi ¹³	agriculture	O	O	O	X
Iroquois ¹⁴	agriculture *	O	O	O	X
Muong ¹⁵	fishing	O	O	O	X
Crow ¹⁶	construction	O	O	O	X
Kikuyu ¹⁷	construction	O	O	O	X
Lobi ⁴	construction II	O	O	O	X
Bantu (southeast) ¹⁸	agriculture II*	O	O	O	O
Tibetans ¹⁹	agriculture *	O	O	O	O
Basuto ²⁰	hunting*	O	O	O	O
Samoans ²¹	fishing	O	O	X	O

¹ W. W. Hill, *The Agricultural and Hunting Methods of the Navaho Indians*, New Haven: Yale University Publications in Anthropology, No. 18, 1938, pp. 96-182.

² Isabel T. Kelly, *Ethnography of the Surprise Valley Paiute*, Berkeley: University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, 31, 3, 1934, p. 88; Robert H. Lowie, *Notes on Shoshonean Ethnography*, New York: Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. XX Pt. III, p. 197.

³ Verne F. Ray, *The Sanpoil and Nespelem*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1933, pp. 77-82.

⁴ Henri Labouret, *Les Tribus du Rameau Lobi*, Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie, 1931, pp. 153-157.

⁵ Rene Maunier, *La Construction collective de la Maison en Kabylie*, Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie, 1926, *passim*.

⁶ H. M. DuBois, S. J., *Monographie des Betsileo*, Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie, 1938, pp. 434-440.

⁷ Melville J. Herskovits, *Life in a Haitian Valley*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1937, pp. 70-75.

⁸ Labouret, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-124.

⁹ W. G. Ivens, *Melanesians of the South-east Solomon Islands*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1927, pp. 149-154.

¹⁰ I. Schapera and A. J. H. Goodwin, "Work and Wealth," in I. Schapera (editor), *The Bantu-speaking Tribes of South Africa*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1950, pp. 151-153, 222ff; D. M. Goodfellow, *Principles of Economic Sociology*, London: George Routledge and Sons, 1939, p. 242.

¹¹ Audrey I. Richards, *Land, Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1939, pp. 145-151, 383ff.

¹² Melville J. Herskovits, *Dahomey*, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1938, pp. 63-77.

¹³ Ernest Beaglehole, *Notes on Hopi Economic Life*, New Haven: Yale University Publications in Anthropology No. 15, 1937, pp. 29-43; C. Daryll Forde, "Hopi Agriculture and Land Ownership," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 41 (1931), pp. 357-405.

¹⁴ B. H. Quain, "The Iroquois" in Margaret Mead (editor), *Cooperation and Competition among Primitive Peoples*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937, pp. 257-258; Carrie A. Lyford, *Iroquois Crafts*, Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute, 1945, p. 15.

¹⁵ Jeanne Cuisinier, *Les Muong*, Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie, 1948, pp. 176-179.

¹⁶ Robert H. Lowie, *The Crow Indians*, New York: Farrar and Rhinehart, 1935, p. 88.

¹⁷ Jomo Kenyatta, *Facing Mount Kenya*, London: Secker and Warburg, 1937, esp. pp. 76-84.

¹⁸ Audrey I. Richards, *Hunger and Work in a Savage Tribe*, London: George Routledge and Sons, 1932, p. 146; Goodfellow, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

¹⁹ Sir Charles Bell, *The People of Tibet*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928.

²⁰ E. Casalis, *Les Bassoutos*, Paris: Librairie de Ch. Meyrueis et Cie., 1859, pp. 179-183.

²¹ Margaret Mead, "The Samoans" in Mead, *op. cit.*, pp. 242-243.

introduced simultaneously, as is often the case in underdeveloped areas.

This pattern is of course in effect a scale, with the response patterns in accord with the criteria for Guttman scaling. At the present stage of research, we merely note this fact. However, there is some indication from our data that the application of scaling techniques in comparative social analysis might provide a means for dealing with diffuse institutionalization without sacrificing theoretical precision—long a major problem in this area of research. Our results further suggest the usefulness of a new approach to Weber's construct of "rational bureaucracy." Reformulation of this construct along lines similar to those indicated, using more items and proceeding from more cases, might aid in isolating those structural variables most strategic to organizational development, and enable the eventual construction of a tenable scale of organizational characteristics on this basis.⁵

We have already noted certain biases in the selection of our cases. Furthermore, some societies are represented more than once. In addition, it is apparent that our "sample" is not very representative on a cross-cultural basis. Moreover, the fact that the pattern was discovered accidentally, *ex post facto*, indicates that it might well have occurred by chance. Thus there is no claim of definitive general validity for our results. Despite these methodological shortcomings, we believe that the consistency of the pattern and its possible implications are suggestive and warrant consideration.

ALIENATION AND MENTAL ILLNESS

ROBERT SOMMER AND ROBERT HALL

*The Saskatchewan Hospital, Weyburn**

In a recent article Nettler¹ presents a scale for measuring alienation which uses as its criterion category, persons who "have been es-

⁵ Freeman and Winch have already demonstrated the feasibility of this general procedure in broader comparative institutional analysis, using the Guttman technique. See Linton C. Freeman and Robert F. Winch, "Societal Complexity: an Empirical Test of a Typology of Societies," *American Journal of Sociology*, 62 (March, 1957), pp. 461-466.

* From the Saskatchewan Committee for Schizophrenia Research. This study was aided by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Department of Health and Welfare (Canada).

¹ G. Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation," *American Sociological Review*, 22 (December, 1957), pp. 670-677.

tranged from their society and the culture it carries." At several points in the paper the author suggests the need for studying the relationship between alienation and psychopathology. He rejects the view that anomie and alienation are equated with personal disorganization, and is inclined towards the view of Maslow² that some degree of alienation must be a characteristic of the fully functioning individual, at least in our society. Although the problem is stated as requiring further research, Nettler hypothesizes a relationship between alienation³ and mental disorder.

This problem is of interest to workers in mental health professions for another reason—this is the question of whether social values are affected by mental illness. It has often been assumed that they are, but there is a dearth of evidence on this question. It cannot be taken for granted that because a man enters a mental hospital, he has rejected the values of the dominant culture. On the basis of research on long-stay patients, it appears more likely that large mental hospitals produce more alienation than they treat. Some patients on chronic wards have not visited a community in years; many do not read a newspaper or receive mail. In such cases, discussions of alienated mental patients should be centered on the disculturating effects of large isolated mental hospitals rather than the relationship between alienation and psychopathology *per se*.

The task at hand is to investigate the degree of alienation of patients recently admitted to a large mental hospital. Their responses on Nettler's scale can be contrasted with those from patients who have spent a number of years at the hospital, and also with Nettler's criterion category of alienated individuals and his unselected population of 515 cases. It should be possible to determine if the newly admitted patient enters the hospital with deviant values or if these are a result of long-term hospitalization.

Method. Large mental hospitals usually possess three types of wards which correspond to the course of a patient's hospitalization. These are the admission ward, the active treatment ward, and finally, the continued treatment wards. In order to assess the degree of alienation of patients on each type of ward, individual interviews were held with approximately twenty patients randomly selected from each type of ward.

² A. H. Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, New York: Harper, 1954.

³ The term "alienation" possesses some invidious connotations that do not relate directly to the dimensions measured by Nettler's scale. We would have preferred to speak simply in terms of "deviant values."

The groups were evenly divided as to sex.⁴ During the interviews, the items from Nettler's scale were read to each patient and his answers were recorded.⁵ If a patient was uncommunicative or overtly delusional, another patient on the ward was selected.⁶

The scale was also administered (in group form) to the hospital physicians and psychiatrists at a scheduled staff conference.

Results. The average score of the patients on the admissions ward was 30.16 which showed them to be less alienated (although not significantly so) than Nettler's unselected population. By *t*-test they are significantly less alienated than the hospital physicians and psychiatrists.

in elections. These patients have been hospitalized many years and have been stripped of both civil rights and channels to the outside. Many can think of the outside only in terms of the world that they knew 25 years ago. In other studies we have found that the longer patients are in the hospital, the fewer visitors they receive.

The patients on the continued treatment ward were considerably older than the other groups of patients. Age alone is not sufficient, however, to account for the relationship between length of hospitalization and alienation because the patients on the active treatment ward were of similar age to those on the admissions ward,

TABLE 1. AVERAGE ALIENATION SCORE

	N	Average Length of Hospital- ization (Years)	Average Age	Average Score *	S.D.
Admission ward patients	19	.26	35.72	30.16	2.69
Active treatment ward patients	21	6.57	36.61	28.14	3.03
Continued treatment ward patients	20	16.50	70.65	25.35	3.05
Hospital physicians	11	—	—	27.73	3.61
Unselected population (Nettler)	515	—	—	28.56	2.92

* Seventeen is the minimum score possible while 34 is the maximum. A low score represents alienation.

An analysis of variance was carried out on the patients' scores classified by type of ward. This yielded an *F* ratio of 10.33 (for 3 and 57 df) which indicated that the groups are significantly different beyond the .01 level. Subsequent *t*-tests disclosed that the patients on the active treatment wards were significantly more alienated than the patients on the admissions wards, while the patients on the continued treatment wards were significantly more alienated than the patients on either the admissions or the active treatment wards.

Discussion. These results are not too surprising, especially as they contrast newly admitted patients with chronic patients. The latter cannot be expected to answer affirmatively to questions concerning voting, new model cars, and interest

but they were significantly more alienated in their responses.

The fact that the physicians deviated more from the cultural norm in their values than the admission ward patients reflects a common condition of bureaucratic organizations with professional staffs. One would expect that the faculty of a university would be more deviant in their values than their students. The physicians at a mental hospital, like a university faculty, are not responsible to the local citizenry or officials. In fact, the hospital staff often live on the hospital grounds and do not consider themselves a part of the local community. Some writers have commented on the voluntary isolation of hospital communities.⁷

The finding that the patients on the admission ward were non-alienated is of theoretical interest in understanding the relationship between mental illness and social values. It appears that social values are largely unaffected by mental illness. The ill person still prefers the same things that his neighbor prefers; hence his difficulties lie in other areas. It seems likely that it is his inability to communicate effectively with his neighbors, rather than a deviant value system,

⁴ As the responses from male and female patients were similar, they are combined in Table 1 rather than presented separately.

⁵ Two of Nettler's items (11. "Do you think you could just as easily live in another society—past or present?" and 17. "Most people live lives of quiet desperation. Do you agree or disagree?") were confusing to the patients.

⁶ A total of eight patients was rejected on this basis. The responses were scored using a two point scale. This method differed slightly from Nettler's use of five response categories scored using a two point scale but it proved more suitable for individual interviewing.

⁷ For example, see R. Sommer, "The Mental Hospital in the Small Community," *Mental Hygiene*, in press; I. Belknap, *Human Problems of a State Mental Hospital*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

that brings him to the hospital. This would suggest that research into other social attitudes (conservatism-liberalism, social distance, etc.) of mental patients would show little difference from the normal population.

These results do not conflict with the theory of the etiology of schizophrenia proposed by Faris.⁸ In his original article there is no mention that the person who becomes a social isolate necessarily possesses a deviant value system. The cases cited focus more on withdrawal for personal reasons (e.g., acne, obesity, effeminacy in a boy, etc.) than withdrawal due to value differences. If one considers a mental hospital as a medium-sized community and that many of the wards contain upwards of 70 people, then it is difficult to speak of the patients as physically isolated from their fellow human beings. The cases of isolation mentioned by Faris are those of prisoners in solitary confinement and sheepherders off by themselves. Patients in large mental hospitals are not denied the opportunity for social contact with their fellows. Such contact is encouraged and even required by the hospital administration. One of the patients' complaints is that they do not have enough privacy. It seems likely that the deviant social values of long-stay patients are attributable more to their isolation from the dominant culture than from other people.

There is, of course, an alternative interpretation of the relationship between value deviance and length of hospitalization. This view hypothesizes that patients who are less deviant in their values are more likely to be discharged from the hospital. A group of long-term patients therefore would be expected to include the patients most deviant in their values. We hope to obtain information on this point. Nettler's scale is being administered routinely to newly admitted patients and in a few years we should be able to determine if the patients with deviant values are the least likely to be discharged.

DISTANCE OF MIGRATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF MIGRANTS *

ARNOLD M. ROSE
University of Minnesota

HYPOTHESIS

Since Stouffer's study in 1940, there have been a number of investigations corroborating his

findings that there is a relationship between the number of migrants and some measure of the distance migrated.¹ Despite the careful procedure and high quality of the research, it has not moved significantly beyond the framework given it by Stouffer, at least not in the direction of relating his variables to other sociological variables. This paper reports an attempt to relate distance of migration to the sociological variable of socio-economic status, thereby tying migration theory into social stratification research. Our hypothesis is that higher status persons, seeking the better jobs or "opportunities," must move a greater distance to find them, on the average, than do persons whose skills or aspirations direct them to look for less desirable opportunities. Perhaps this means, in part, that large corporations, which control many of the "opportunities" for which people move, are more likely to move their top people than their lower level personnel. Our hypothesis is limited to movement into urban American areas, and our data are limited to migrants into the Minneapolis area.

the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota for a grant-in-aid to conduct the research on which this article is based. The author is also grateful to Joseph Shechtman for his careful and intelligent assistance in carrying out the laborious work in connection with this research.

¹ Samuel A. Stouffer, "Intervening Opportunities: A Theory Relating Mobility and Distance," *American Sociological Review*, 5 (December, 1940), pp. 845-867; Margaret L. Bright and Dorothy S. Thomas, "Interstate Migration and Intervening Opportunities," *ibid.*, 6 (December, 1941), pp. 773-780; Eleanor C. Isbell, "Internal Migration in Sweden and Intervening Opportunities," *ibid.*, 9 (December, 1944), pp. 627-639; Donald J. Bogue and Warren S. Thompson, "Migration and Distance," *ibid.*, 14 (April, 1949), pp. 236-244. Strodbeck has also corroborated Stouffer's conclusion while providing an addition to his theory: Fred Strodbeck, "Equal Opportunity Intervals: A Contribution to the Method of Intervening Opportunity Analysis," *ibid.*, 14 (August, 1949), pp. 490-497. Zipf has also provided a corroboration, although he used a less adequate theory—as shown by Anderson: George Kingsley Zipf, "The P_iP_j/D Hypothesis: On the Intercity Movement of Persons," *ibid.*, 11 (December, 1946), pp. 677-686; Theodore R. Anderson, "Intermetropolitan Migration: A Comparison of the Hypotheses of Zipf and Stouffer," *ibid.*, 20 (June, 1955), pp. 287-291. With a still different theoretical framework, Dodd has also corroborated the finding: Stuart C. Dodd, "The Interaction Hypothesis: A Gravity Model Fitting Physical Masses and Human Groups," *ibid.*, 15 (April, 1950), pp. 245-256.

* R. E. L. Faris, "Cultural Isolation and the Schizophrenic Personality," *American Journal of Sociology*, 40 (1934), pp. 155-169.

* The author wishes to express his appreciation to

PROCEDURE

The most complete list of in-migrants to the Minneapolis area would seem to be a compilation of the names of new customers of the local electric company, whose service almost everyone in a metropolitan area uses. The Northern States Power Company kindly supplied data for the period March 15-July 1, 1955, listing each of its new residential accounts whose last previous address was outside the company's service area (Minneapolis, its suburbs, and some of the outlying parts of Hennepin County to the south and west of Minneapolis). Both the new local address and the place moved from were listed. Not all in-migrants to Minneapolis are immediately included in the sample: while practically everybody in and near a city uses electricity, people who rent hotel rooms, other furnished rooms and occasionally apartments

may not become customers of the electric company, as some landlords assume the costs of electricity themselves (a customary practice when single rooms are rented). If these persons later move into their own homes or apartments, however, they become new customers of the electric company, and so get into our sample.

We used an "ecological" technique to obtain an index of the socio-economic status of our migrants. Each census tract and suburb of Minneapolis was ranked on four characteristics, as indicated by the Census:² (1) median rent,

² U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1950*, Vol. III, Census Tract Statistics, Chapter 33 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952). The technique was developed by Albert Mayer for the Chicago Community Inventory of 1949, and was transmitted to us by Leo Reeder.

TABLE 1. DISTANCE MOVED AS RELATED TO CLASS OF NEIGHBORHOOD MOVED TO
(Percentage Distributions and Medians of Distance for Each Class)

Zone moved from		Census Tract Class							
		I	II	III	IV	V	Totals	V	V
		(high)				(low)		non-	white
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1.	0-25 miles East	13.59	16.67	13.06	19.63	11.78	14.58	9.09	16.67
1.	0-25 miles West	4.84	2.78	5.86	1.84	3.36	4.18	2.60	4.76
2.	26-80 miles East	3.91	4.44	5.86	6.14	6.72	4.91	5.19	9.52
2.	26-80 miles West	5.96	7.78	8.11	10.43	5.04	7.13	7.79	0.00
3.	81-160 miles East	4.28	6.67	7.66	6.75	9.25	6.06	10.39	7.14
3.	81-160 miles West	7.83	8.33	13.06	14.72	10.08	9.99	7.79	14.29
4.	161-240 miles East	2.42	2.78	1.80	3.68	8.40	3.11	5.19	14.29
4.	161-240 miles West	7.45	10.55	7.66	11.66	9.25	8.68	11.69	4.76
5.	241-400 miles East	11.37	8.88	7.21	3.07	3.36	8.35	3.90	2.38
5.	241-400 miles West	4.66	5.56	4.51	4.91	6.72	5.00	7.79	4.76
6.	401-625 miles East	5.96	2.78	1.80	0.61	4.20	3.85	6.49	0.00
6.	401-625 miles West	4.47	1.67	3.60	3.07	3.36	3.60	3.90	2.38
7.	626-920 miles East	1.49	3.89	0.45	0.00	1.68	1.47	1.30	2.38
7.	626-920 miles West	1.86	1.11	0.90	1.23	0.00	1.31	0.00	0.00
8.	921-1200 miles East	5.21	3.33	3.15	0.61	2.52	3.69	0.00	7.14
8.	921-1200 miles West	0.37	0.56	2.25	0.61	1.68	0.90	1.30	2.38
9.	1200+ miles East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9.	1200+ miles West	5.77	3.89	5.41	4.91	5.88	5.32	9.09	0.00
7.	626-920 miles South	3.72	4.44	3.15	1.23	2.52	3.28	3.90	0.00
8.	921-1200 miles South	2.42	1.11	0.90	2.45	0.00	1.72	0.00	0.00
9.	1200+ miles South	0.37	0.56	0.90	0.00	2.52	0.66	2.60	2.38
	Canada	0.19	1.11	0.90	0.61	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.00
	Territories	0.56	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00
	Foreign	1.30	1.11	1.35	1.84	1.68	1.39	0.00	4.76
Total percentages		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total cases		537	180	222	163	119	1221	77	42
East median		237.4	123.3	96.5	30.6	127.2	126.5	130.0	120.0
West median		191.9	177.7	151.7	158.4	196.4	176.2	213.3	146.6
General median*		237.6	180.0	146.0	124.6	177.0	181.4	193.8	150.0

* The general median is not midway between the medians for east and west, as it is based also on migration from the South and from outside continental United States.

(2) median school years completed, (3) percentage of professional workers among all employed workers, and (4) percentage of native whites in the population.³ These rankings were divided into quintiles, and the mean of the four quintile ratings was calculated for each tract. The means were designated the "socio-economic status index." These means were then grouped into quintiles, which were arbitrarily designated the "class" for each tract or suburb. The "address moved to" of each person on the list was then located by census tract or suburb and characterized by this class number. The class of the in-migrant is thus ecologically determined on the basis of the characteristics of the community into which he moved.

The "place moved from" was classified as falling within one of nine concentric rings drawn to cover the entire United States, with the center at Minneapolis. The rings are as follows:

- Zone 1—0-25 miles from Minneapolis
- Zone 2—26-80 miles
- Zone 3—81-160 miles
- Zone 4—161-240 miles
- Zone 5—241-400 miles
- Zone 6—401-625 miles
- Zone 7—626-920 miles
- Zone 8—921-1200 miles
- Zone 9—1200+ miles

In addition, each "place moved from" was classified as being either east or west of the Mississippi River (on which Minneapolis is located), and the Southern states (as defined by the Census) were kept in a separate category. Previous residences outside the continental United States were also separately counted.

The total number of newcomers to the Minneapolis area that became customers of the electric company during the period March 15-July 1, 1955,⁴ was 1,454. Of this number, 203 were dropped because they moved into rural areas of Hennepin County for which there are no data to characterize socio-economic status, and another 30 were dropped because of errors or ambiguities in the listing—leaving a total of 1,221 cases. The distribution of these cases, according to class of neighborhood moved into as well as distance and direction of previous residence, is shown in Table 1. (A highly disproportionate percentage—44 per cent—of the cases moved into Class I neighborhoods. This

indicates the vigorous growth of the new, more desirable residential suburbs as well as the "upper class" character of so many in-migrants.)

FINDINGS

It will be noted from the table that the distance moved steadily declines with the class of neighborhood moved into, from Class I to Class IV, thus supporting our general hypothesis. Class V presents the exception. The median distance migrated is 237.6 miles for those moving into Class I neighborhoods down to 124.6 miles for those moving into Class IV neighborhoods. On the other hand, those moving into Class V neighborhoods come from about the same distance as those moving into Class II neighborhoods—177 miles and 180 miles, respectively.

Our first thought upon discovering this exception was that non-whites (predominantly Negroes) provided the exception, since they usually had to migrate considerable distances in order to go to Minneapolis and yet their general social circumstances put them into the lowest class neighborhoods. By dividing Class V neighborhoods into those that were also in the highest quintile of percentage non-whites (called "non-white neighborhoods") and those that were in the four other quintiles (called "white neighborhoods"), this guess is shown to have considerable merit (see the last two columns of the table). The migrants into the non-white class of neighborhoods moved 194 miles on the average, whereas the migrants into the white neighborhoods moved only 150 miles. This suggests that our general hypothesis covering the relation between class of migrant and distance migrated is limited to whites and does not apply to disadvantaged minority groups: poor Negroes (predominantly from the South) migrate a considerable distance, and one might say that their motivation to migrate is greater than that of whites. Partly for this reason, our hypothesis may be termed "culture-bound."

But even those who migrate into "white" Class V neighborhoods have migrated a greater distance than they should have, according to our general hypothesis. We have no satisfactory explanation of this finding, unless it be that our technique of separating whites from non-whites is inadequate. The data on which neighborhoods are classified are as of 1950 whereas the migration data are as of 1955; there had been very heavy migration of Negroes during the intervening period.⁵ It should also be noted that a

³ *Ibid.* Selected from Tables 1, 2, and 3.

⁴ While our complete sample is only for this 3½ month period, we spot-checked the migrants during the rest of the year to make sure that there was no significant difference in distribution by socio-economic class between the migrants during the sample period and those who migrated in other seasons of the year.

⁵ The census of 1950 records 6,807 Negroes in Minneapolis. On August 9, 1957, the director of the Minneapolis Urban League estimated that there were 10,000 Negroes in the city (Shelton B. Granger,

significant proportion of Minneapolis Negroes do not live in Negro neighborhoods.⁶

Another interesting finding is that, while migrants into Class I neighborhoods are more likely to come from the east than from the west, the reverse is increasingly the case for migrant moving into neighborhoods II to IV. What seems to be indicated here is that many upper class migrants are coming from the large urban centers to the east, while the middle class migrants come primarily from the rural and small town areas to the west (Minneapolis is the nearest metropolis for people living in the Dakotas and Montana as well as those in rural Minnesota). A check on the specific places of origin of the migrants shows this to be the fact. Again, Class V migrants provide something of an exception: while a majority of them come from the west, the proportion coming from the west is not as great as might be expected from observing the trend as we move down the class level of neighborhood.

CONCLUSION

These data indicate that the "upper class" neighborhoods are being disproportionately filled with persons who have migrated a long distance, while the opposite is true for the "poorer class" neighborhoods. The exception is for the poorest class of neighborhoods, but most of these contain disproportionate numbers of Negro residents who are being augmented significantly by migrants coming all the way from the South.

In Stouffer's terms it might be said that, generally speaking, lower-class people find many more intervening opportunities in a given dis-

tance than upper-class people do. Relatively specialized persons and others who seek the better-paying jobs must move a greater distance to find them, while those who are less specialized—whose remuneration is lower on the average—can find their "opportunities" close by. Similarly, when employers seek employees to fill specialized (including managerial) positions, they must look farther afield and move them a greater distance, than when they seek workers to fill relatively unspecialized positions.

The fact that the non-whites move a considerable distance and hence are an exception to our general conclusion, serves to indicate that the main finding is culture-bound. Migrant Negroes are of the lowest socio-economic status, and generally must accept the poorest jobs and residences in this Northern city—jobs and residences which, if racial discrimination was absent, they could find much closer to their original homes. Their reason for migrating the unusually long distance seems to be to vacate the Southern culture area. (The relatively small number of Negroes migrating to Minneapolis probably often select this particular community because friends or relatives have already established a community there.)

Another finding indicating that our general conclusion is culture-bound is that upper class migrants come predominantly from the east (from urban centers), whereas the middle and lower class migrants come predominantly from the west (from rural areas and small towns). In other words, the geographic position of a city can have different significance as an "opportunity" for migration for different segments of the population.

The migrants who move into the lowest class areas provide something of an exception to these general findings, but they also constitute the smallest number among the classes of migrants (only 9.7 per cent). On the whole, "intervening opportunities" during migration mean different things to upper, middle, and lower class people, to Negroes and whites, and to eastern urbanites and western rural people.

⁶Statement for the Legislative Interim Commission, State of Minnesota, unpublished, August 9, 1957). Except for the in-migration of Negroes—who still constitute less than 2 per cent of the total population—Minneapolis neighborhoods have changed relatively little since 1950, so that the use of data from the two dates would have no other implications for the findings of this paper.

⁶Even by 1950, Negroes were reported living in 82 per cent of the city's census tracts.

COMMUNICATIONS

ON MODERN SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY IN CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

To the Editor:

Recently I received a letter from Professor George A. Lundberg concerning the interpretation of his work in Chapter 4 of the recent volume edited by Alvin Boskoff and myself, *Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*. In fairness to Professor Lundberg, I feel that his communication should be spread on the pages of the official journal. He writes:

In their chapter (4) the authors assert that:

- (1) "He [Lundberg] maintains that 'introspection cannot be a source of scientific knowledge.'"
- (2) "Lundberg feels that it is 'prescientific' and 'mystical' for social scientists to deal with motives, values, feelings, and ends."

Both statements are contrary to my explicit and consistent statements on the subjects mentioned, as anyone interested may ascertain from the following references to my published work over a period of 25 years:

On introspection: "Is Sociology Too Scientific?" *Sociologus*, 9 (Sept. 1933), pp. 311-12; (. . . reprinted *verbatim* in my recent paper, "The National Science Trend," *American Journal of Sociology*, (November, 1955), p. 195, *Foundations of Sociology*, (1939) p. 20; *Social Research* (2nd Ed., 1942) pp. 19, 20, 331.

On motives, values, feelings, ends: *Foundations*, pp. 11, 20, 221-22, 272-74, 288; *Can Science Save Us?* pp. 19, 26-33, 99-103; "Human Values—A Research Program," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, Vol. XVIII, Sept. 1950, pp. 103-111.

Please note that I am not here objecting to any . . . evaluation of my statements on these subjects, but only to the unwarranted attribution to me of views contrary to those I have consistently held in my published works. I say "unwarranted" because the authors do not give a single reference to any of my published work where I made statements warranting the attribution to me of the views in question. The only reference cited is to a secondary work, namely, Timasheff's *Sociological Theory* (New York, 1955), a work even more flagrantly in error on the subject under discussion than the Becker-Boskoff text. (See the review of Timasheff's work by F. C. Madigan, S. J., in *Social Forces*, October 1955, p. 85. See also my references to Timasheff in my "The Natural Science Trend in Sociology," cited above.)

I submit this bibliography for the benefit of the next writer of a book on contemporary sociological theory who may wish to consider the actual views of the authors surveyed as set forth in the original sources.

As senior editor (in the sense of being the older of the two) of the symposium in question, I should like to make a statement about editorial responsibility. As mentioned in the preface (page vi), "At no point have we in any way attempted to control the specific content of any of the chapters." This means that the authors of Chapter 4 are themselves responsible for the interpretation offered. However, as senior editor in the sense above mentioned, I feel that I should . . . take responsibility for not having asked the authors to provide specific footnote references to Professor Lundberg's work at the point in question. It should hastily be added, however, that there are no less than 17 other points at which Professor Lundberg's work is mentioned, sometimes at reasonable length, and at each of these 17 there *are* citations, many of them to the articles and books mentioned in his communication. This of course is not absolution for the omission; a sin is a sin even when it is a little one.

You . . . have recently invited me to comment on two communications. . . . The first of these, from Professor Record and Williams [see June, 1958, issue of the *Review*], called attention to what they view as inadequacies in the presentation of the work of Professor Richard Thurnwald, recently deceased, of the University of Berlin. The presentation referred to appears in Chapter 23, written in German by Professor W. E. Mühlmann, and translated by Mr. Leon Fannin of the University of Wisconsin. What these former students of Thurnwald's have to say about inadequacies is in considerable measure justified, but here again I should like to refer to the preface (page viii): "We can only hope that readers will view charitably the inevitable flow arising when 425,000 words are reduced to about 275,000." Professor Mühlmann had a good deal more to say about Thurnwald than appeared in print, but his contribution, regrettably enough, was squeezed along with the others. I myself hold Thurnwald's work in high regard as evidenced by *Social Thought from Lore to Science* (pp. 931-32) and *For a Science of Social Man* (John Gillin, ed.; pp. 124-25).

In the passage last cited, the following sentence appears: "In 1953 *Sociologus* was revised, with Thurnwald still as editor; long may it flourish!"

The other communication came . . . from Professor Mühlmann himself. Here he made reference to these facts: (1) his contribution was condensed—a point mentioned above; (2) the corrections that he made in the English translation were not transferred to the printed page—here indeed there was a slip-up; and (3) he did not see any of the proofs—the result of the fact that, which he perhaps did not know when he wrote, . . . the typesetting of the book was done [in] Belgium, with resulting difficulties in the editorial arrangements. . . . there was no promise to any contributor that proofs would be submitted, largely because inevitable tangles of intercontinental mail service were foreseen.

I naturally regret and apologize for these blemishes, and can only hope that others which have not yet come to attention will prove to be of minor significance. In concluding, may I also extend my apologies to those who may in the future feel aggrieved?

HOWARD BECKER

University of Wisconsin

ON "SOCIAL POWER AND COMMITMENT"

To the Editor:

The article by E. Abramson, H. A. Cutler, R. W. Kautz and M. Mendelson on "Social Power and Commitment" in the February, 1958 issue of the *Review* is both a provocative and suggestive model for power analysis. The distinction between short-run and long-run objectives and the proposition that "the nearer the horizon, the fewer alternative courses of action are consistent with the expectation" (p. 19) are especially useful. . . .

Excessive dependence on economic modes of analysis, however, leads the authors into serious difficulties when they are applied to sociological theory. As Arnold Rose has indicated, in using the deductive model characteristic of economics, sociologists must begin with "significant truisms" or "pragmatically a priori propositions" which serve as the basis for inference.¹ The authors do not indicate clearly such a set of self-evident propositions.—Is it in their distinction between open, closed and committed lines of action? If so, the definition of power as "potentially for action" need not necessarily be adopted.

¹ *Theory and Method in the Social Sciences*, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954, Chapter 22.

Even more serious questions arise when the authors' correlative concepts of power and authority are put to the empirical test. The crucial feature of power is said to be the availability to the actor of alternative lines of action; in this case, the lines are open and there is no responsibility. On the other hand, the actor with authority is restricted to lines of commitment and is responsible. Thus power and authority are analytically distinct (even contradictory): "While authority is often confused with power, it is *not* power." (p. 20) If this argument is taken seriously . . . , all dictionaries will require re-editing. A Robin Hood will have power while the English king will have authority but no power (over Robin Hood?). A gangster will have power but J. Edgar Hoover will have merely authority. And so on. This argument also means that increase in authority leads to decrease in power, since lines of commitment become more clearly defined and hence (in logic, at least) reduce the number of alternatives for action. This is formalism with a vengeance. It contradicts the large evidence of experience, frequently documented,² that increase in authority may open up *more* alternatives, in fact, alternatives often closed to the irresponsible.

Part of the difficulty in this deductive model may be that the *interactive* aspect of power receives less attention than the active. The element of pressure so characteristic of the power situation is ignored; competitors are mentioned, for example, but not antagonists. In by-passing the element of conflict in the power process, the authors in fact miss the process itself in their analogy to a chess game. Their static conception of power probably results from preoccupation with economic models: the purposefully-rational activity of "economic man" (Weber's *Zweck-Rational*) is a limited type. Moreover, their view that lines of action necessarily open up more alternatives without than within an authority system has an individualistic ring. The actor and his alternatives are considered in such abstraction from the recipient of power-acts that the discussion often seems atomistic, even solipsistic. Power is a *relational* concept. . . . It is significant that this presumably inclusive discussion of power

² For example, Neil W. Chamberlain shows that executive authority in the corporation represents an inverted pyramid with fewer alternatives at the bottom than top. "As one proceeds up the management ladder, the area of discretion increases, and the broadest area of authority is to be found at the top of the management framework." *The Union Challenge to Management Control*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948, pp. 30-31. Italics mine.

and authority contains no reference to superordination or subordination.

R. A. SCHERMERHORN

Western Reserve University

REPLY TO SCHERMERHORN

To the Editor:

Professor Schermerhorn's interest in our model of social power is gratifying and indicative of the current concern about the definition of power. His comments are helpful in examining the model on two fronts: the empirical and the methodological.

The Empirical Test. The more serious questions arise for Schermerhorn when the concepts of power and authority are put to the empirical test. The first task, then, is to examine his examples of Hoover and the Hoods. In each instance, he applies an analysis that is foreign to our model.

In the example of Robin Hood, Schermerhorn states that under our system, Robin Hood has power but the king does not—a statement he finds palpably untrue. This conclusion, we submit, results from a failure to follow the argument closely, and from the use of a meaning of "authority" which is not ours. We would analyze the situation as follows: One common objective toward which the king and Robin Hood aspire is the control of Sherwood Forest. Because the king is absent from the scene of action and must deal through an intermediary (the Sheriff of Nottingham), and because Robin Hood not only occupies the site under contention but also has the sympathies and allegiances of the people nearby, he has more lines of action available to him than does the king. In short, Robin Hood does have more power than the king *with regard to this common objective*.

Another common objective of the Sheriff and Robin Hood is determination of the latter's destiny. The Sheriff hoped to gain the first objective of re-establishing his control over Sherwood Forest by killing Robin Hood, who must prevent this, obviously, if he is to retain control over Sherwood Forest. We take it this "antagonism" between Robin Hood and the Sheriff is an instance of conflict. Our analysis remains unchanged.

The fact that he is technically a subject of the king is of importance to the extent that it influences Robin Hood's lines of action. To use our terminology, an authority situation does not exist here because there is not a one-to-one relationship between expectations and commitments on the part of the two men. We note that the tale tells that the absence of an

authority condition is owing to the usurpation by a "bad" king. If the law had been rightfully discharged, as under Richard, the whole series of events would not have occurred. This is to say, a power condition would not have developed.

In the examples of Hoover and the corporation executives Schermerhorn again fails to appreciate the necessity of specifying a shared goal. The immediate objective of the junior executive is not the same as that of the chairman of the board. We would not deny that the head of the corporation has more alternatives with regard to his objective than do his juniors; the literature of management makes it abundantly clear that the same things are not expected of him. The corporation fulfills the authority condition better at the lower levels than at the higher. In the case of Hoover it should be remembered that the organization as actor may have open lines of action (power), lines which may be denied to particular actors within the organization.

Schermerhorn's discussion provides an excellent example of the problems encountered when divergent meanings are assigned to a single concept. Our study stems from the conviction that the concept of social power is in want either of a more analytically useful definition or of abandonment by social scientists.

Methodology. We frankly admit our failure to find Schermerhorn's substantiation of his comment that "excessive dependence on economic modes of analysis" leads us "into serious difficulties. . . ." The deductive method is neither strange to sociologists nor unique to economists. The methodological point that deductive models are based on "pragmatically *a priori* propositions" is acknowledged. Neither this nor the assumptions of our model presents unique difficulties to sociological theory.

The assumptions underlying our model of social interaction fall into two principal classes: those which define essentially the form that the theory is to take; and those which amplify the meaning of our definitions and hence supply greater precision to the analysis. Concerning the former, we assume that social power is a condition of social action, and that a theory of social action is more useful when developed as a theory of social interaction (pp. 19, 20). A theory of social power must consider social power as potentiality for action, as enabling action to occur (p. 17). The component elements of a theory of interaction are: two or more actors, a fabric of social control, means (lines of action), ends (expectations, objectives) (p. 18), and conditions or modes of action, which in our theory are power and authority (p. 20).

From the preceding considerations, we further assume that actors are capable of selecting ob-

jectives and of determining the lines of action appropriate to them (p. 15). We find it useful to classify these lines of action as committed, closed, and open. Power as potentiality for action is not derived, as Schermerhorn queries, from our consideration of the distinctions among open, closed, and committed lines of action. Rather the reverse: the analytical distinctions among lines of action derive from our self-evident proposition that power is potentiality for action.

Although we have indicated that our theory is an interactive theory (pp. 17, 19, 20), we share Professor Schermerhorn's desire for a fuller development of its interactive aspects. This requires that we inquire into the strategies of action appropriate to the conditions of power and authority.

E. ABRAMSON, H. A. CUTLER,
and R. W. KAUTZ

The Pennsylvania State University

CLASS AND BEHAVIOR—A REPLY

To the Editor:

In the June, 1958, issue of the *Review*, Chester L. Hunt comments upon my article (and others), "Social Class, Child Rearing, and Child Behavior" (*American Sociological Review*, 22 [December, 1957]). In reply to Mr. Hunt, I call attention to the following points:

(1) There is no evidence that life histories or teacher reports are more valid than interviews with parents. The assumption that a parent interview means a severely biased interview is unfortunate. They can be biased, of course, but with a "normal" rather than a clinic population, my own feeling is that they have been underestimated.

(2) What Hunt calls a "traditional sociological notion" has been questioned not only by this study but by many others. Surely our science is made up of more than the "tradition" established by one study, admirable and influential though it was!

(3) It could be seen whether the dichotomous break cancelled out important differences at the extremes by inspecting and checking the actual social status distributions. These originally contained nine socio-economic levels. Alternative methods of analysis had been planned if more complex breaks were needed, but the dichotomy seemed adequate for this sample. Theoretically, it is far from adequate, and Hunt's emphasis on finding "more typical" middle and lower class respondents seems to me to miss the point as to what is needed in future studies, namely a better theory of social structure, one which will take more account of clusters and sub-groups in the general population than this study did. I would particularly like to see more emphasis on social mobility.

(4) I believe Hunt is inaccurate in calling my middle class sample "lower middle." Table 1 shows that 42 per cent of the middle group have Warner's top occupational rating, and all but two of the fathers have attended college. Moreover, the differences between middle and working class as to education, earning power, and occupation of father and mother's father are far from minor.

In controversial issues of this sort, methodological criticism is vital, but I think we should be somewhat cautious that it not be used to obscure consideration of results which do not fit previous conceptions.

MARTHA S. WHITE

Lexington, Massachusetts

Grants for Asian Sociologists

The American Sociological Society has received from The Asia Foundation a grant of \$2,500, for the purpose of encouraging closer relations between Asian and American sociologists. The funds will be used in three ways:

- (1) To enable Asian sociologists to become members of the American Sociological Society and to receive a three-year subscription to one or more of its official publications.

(Membership in the Society and a three-year subscription to the *American Sociological Review* will be \$1.00; if all Society publications are desired, the three-year cost will be \$2.00. Applicants should write directly to The American Sociological Society, New York University, Washington Square, New York 3, New York. Payment may be made in UNESCO coupons or in any way convenient and acceptable under the exchange regulations of the Asian country concerned. The privilege is extended to graduate students as well as to established sociologists.)

- (2) To enable libraries, university departments, and research institutes in Asia, who have heretofore been unable to subscribe, to subscribe to publications of the Society at reduced rates.

(The cost of a three-year institutional subscription to the *American Sociological Review* will be \$2.00; and for all the publications of the Society, including *Sociometry*, \$3.00—payable as above.)

- (3) To supplement travel expenses for Asian sociologists who are in the United States and who wish to attend meetings of the American Sociological Society.

(Applicants must be at least at the graduate student level and may come from any Asian country from Afghanistan eastward. An applicant should write to the Chairman of the administering committee, as listed below. In his request the applicant should give his regular academic position, the nature of his study or visit in the United States, the meeting which he plans to attend, and the sum necessary for transportation to and from the meeting.)

The grant is being administered by a special committee composed of the following:

Professor Kingsley Davis, *Chairman*, Department of Sociology and Social Institutions, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Professor Wolfram Eberhard, Department of Sociology and Social Institutions, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Professor Amos H. Hawley, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Professor Marion J. Levy, Jr., Department of Sociology, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Professor Bryce F. Ryan, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Miami, Coral Gables 46, Florida.

THE PROFESSION: REPORTS AND OPINION

FLORIAN ZNANIECKI, 1882-1958

THEODORE ABEL
Hunter College

In his life and work Florian Znaniecki exemplified magnificently the type of Creative Personality he so brilliantly described in *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918) and in *The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge* (1941). His mind was continually active on the frontiers of knowledge, probing and ordering, inventive and bold. For Znaniecki, writing was a passion. He wrote for publication because he had enthusiasm for his ideas and, confident of their validity, he wished to communicate them to others. He succeeded admirably in this. Excepting Herbert Spencer, there is hardly another sociologist who wrote with equal simplicity and clarity and who, in argument, was able to anticipate the reader's most penetrating questions. There can be disagreement with what Znaniecki said, but never any doubt as to his premises or what he meant to say.

His enthusiasm for communication also infected his teaching. He knew how to evoke understanding and appreciation of a subject, possessing a masterly touch which stimulated creative efforts in his students. In his relations with people he was always generous and completely free of guile. Although he was aware of his superior intellect and achievement, he never used their qualities for self-aggrandizement.

Florian Znaniecki began his career as a poet. After finishing gymnasium in Poland he went to Paris in pursuit of poetic inspiration. There he came under the influence of Henri Bergson's "creative evolution," which Znaniecki translated into Polish. The contact with Bergson influenced him to change his principal interest from poetry to philosophy. Studying at various universities in France and Switzerland, Znaniecki led a turbulently romantic life which included a period of service in the Foreign Legion, and finally obtained his doctorate at the University of Cracow with a thesis on *The Problems of Value in Philosophy* (1910).

In 1912 Znaniecki published a significant volume on *Humanism and Knowledge*, which led to his recognition as second only to Lukaszewicz

among Polish philosophers. While waiting for a university post he worked for the Immigration Service in Warsaw. There he was "discovered" by W. I. Thomas who invited him to go to Chicago in 1914; thus was initiated one of the finest examples of teamwork in the history of the social sciences. These two were creative and imaginative men, and they complemented each other in temperament. Thomas taught Znaniecki the sociological viewpoint. He was rewarded by evoking from Znaniecki the interpretation of Polish culture and the broad theoretical framework which have made *The Polish Peasant* a sociological classic.

During his stay in Chicago Znaniecki published *Cultural Reality* (1919). This book contained the germ of the major ideas developed in his subsequent writings. In 1920 he accepted a Chair of Philosophy at the University of Poznan where he inaugurated courses in sociology and organized an institute for sociological research. He quickly attracted a number of promising young scholars and directed them along the path which he envisaged for sociology, including the use of the methods employed so successfully for *The Polish Peasant*. Under his leadership, and with the assistance of Josef Chalasinski and others, the Poznan Institute began the large scale project of collecting personal documents and biograms from members of all significant categories of the population. An enormous amount of material was collected resulting in several major studies. Unfortunately, the Nazis destroyed all of this during the invasion in 1939.

At Poznan Znaniecki continued his scholarly work, bringing out several volumes in Polish: *The Downfall of Civilization* (1922), *Contemporary Man* (1927), *The Sociology of Education* (1930), and others. In 1931, *The Laws of Social Psychology*, written in English, was published.

In 1932 Columbia University invited Znaniecki to conduct a study of the effect of social change on education. Largely as a result of his participation in the famous Sunday seminar, headed by Robert MacIver, Znaniecki produced the most mature formulation, until then, of his theoretical position in *The Method of Sociology* (1934). On his return to Poland, he initiated

the ambitious program of systematizing sociological knowledge in terms of what he viewed as its four basic divisions: social action, social relations, social persons, and social groups. The first fruit of this effort was *Social Action* (1937).

As luck had it, Znaniecki was called to Columbia to teach during the summer of 1939. When war threatened he hastened his return to Poland. But the war caught up with him when he reached England and he returned to Columbia to deliver a series of lectures which were embodied in *The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge* (1941). In 1942 Znaniecki accepted a professorship at the University of Illinois where he carried on a very productive career of teaching and writing until his retirement.

Of his latest books, *Modern Nationalities* (1951) best illustrates the application of his sociological viewpoint to a specific problem, and *Cultural Sciences* (1952) is the most complete formulation of his views on the nature and tasks of the science of man. At the time of his death Znaniecki was completing the third volume of a series which he planned to issue under the title *Systematic Sociology*.

Znaniecki's election to the presidency of the American Sociological Society in 1953 reflected the international character of his contribution to sociology and the preeminence of his work. Second only to Simmel, Znaniecki pioneered the conception of sociology as a special science. He was also one of the first to stress the importance of research which takes full account of the special characteristics of humanistic data. His systematization of the field of sociology was a major contribution. In any future Hall of Fame for sociologists, Florian Znaniecki will occupy a prominent place.

R. RICHARD WOHL, 1921-1957

DONALD HORTON
The University of Chicago

R. Richard Wohl, Associate Professor of the Social Sciences in the College of the University of Chicago and associate of the Committee on Human Development and the Department of Sociology, died on November 15, 1957. He was a graduate of New York University, with the M.A. in Economics from Yale and a Ph.D. in Social Science from Harvard. Before assuming his teaching position at Chicago he had been associated with the Research Center in Entrepreneurial History at Harvard and the Research Center for Economic Development and Cultural Change at Chicago. At the time of his death, a unique intellectual career in which were fused comprehensive skills in the social sciences and enthusiastic interest in economic and social history and popular culture, was beginning. To this short-lived enterprise he brought a rare combination of technical competence, severe standards of scholarship, constant play of imagination and wit, literary talent and great productivity; but because he was severely self-critical, many of his writings were put aside, unpublished, to await the test of later readings. A major work on American success ideologies remains unpublished, except for a paper entitled "The 'Rags to Riches Story': An Episode of Secular Idealism," which appeared in *Class, Status and Power*, edited by Reinhard Bendix and S. M. Lipset. His chief memorial will be a social history of Kansas City, Missouri, for which he received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, and which is now being carried to completion by his research associates.

OFFICIAL REPORTS AND PROCEEDINGS

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS, 1958

In accordance with the Society's By-Laws and with due regard for the fields of specialization and the geographical distribution of the members, President Robin M. Williams, Jr., appointed the following Committee on Nominations and Elections: Herbert Blumer, *Chairman*; Howard W. Beers, Gordon W. Blackwell, Ernest W. Burgess, W. Fred Cottrell, Burton R. Fisher, E. Franklin Frazier, Oswald Hall, Alex Inkeles, Katharine Jocher, Delbert C. Miller, Theodore M. Newcomb, Peter H. Rossi, Bryce Ryan, Vincent H. Whitney.

The Committee first cast four ballots in order

to nominate the candidates for President-Elect, before proceeding to two further ballots on the other candidates. The slate, as finally accepted on December 26, 1957, was as follows:

President-Elect

Howard Becker
Paul F. Lazarsfeld

Vice-President-Elect

Wilbert E. Moore
William H. Sewell

Committee on Publications

Reinhard Bendix
Gordon W. Blackwell

Council

Joseph H. Fichter
 Ronald Freedman
 George C. Homans
 Seymour Martin Lipset
 Charles P. Loomis
 E. William Noland
 John W. Riley, Jr.
 Edgar A. Schuler

Ballots were mailed from the Executive Office on February 24, 1958, to the 2,519 Active members of the Society. In line with the suggestion made by the 1957 Committee, ballots were sent by air mail to members in distant foreign countries. Ballots were returned by April 1 by 1,382 members, who constitute 55 per cent of the voting membership. Write-in votes mentioned over one hundred additional names, but no one person received more than three write-in votes for any office.

The tellers, appointed by the Chairman, were: Ernest Greenwood, Donald L. Foley, and Jack London, all of the University of California at Berkeley. Procedural instructions which have developed over the years for validating and counting ballots were carefully followed, and all identification was removed from the ballots before the tally was made.

The Committee wishes to bring to the attention of the Society the advisability of investigating the feasibility of mechanical means of ballot counting. This suggestion is prompted by the tremendous amount of time that went into the counting of ballots, a chore which will grow with the inevitable increase in the Society's membership.

The following nominees were elected:

President-Elect

Howard Becker

Vice-President-Elect

Wilbert E. Moore

Committee on Publications

Gordon W. Blackwell

Council

George C. Homans
 Seymour Martin Lipset
 Charles P. Loomis
 John W. Riley, Jr.

Respectfully submitted,

HERBERT BLUMER, *Chairman*

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

ARTICLE I. NAME

Section 1. The Society shall be known as the American Sociological Society.

ARTICLE II. OBJECTS

Section 1. The objects of the Society shall be to stimulate and improve research instruction and discussion, and to encourage cooperative relations among persons engaged in the scientific study of society.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Any person interested in the objects of this Society shall be eligible to membership. The forms of membership and the privileges and dues of members are set forth in By-Laws, Art. I.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the Society shall be a President, a President-Elect, a Vice-President, a Vice-President-Elect, a Secretary, an Editor of the *American Sociological Review*, and an Executive Officer. The President-Elect

and Vice-President-Elect shall be elected by the membership. The President-Elect and the Vice-President-Elect shall serve for one year, and shall then automatically become President and Vice-President respectively for one-year terms. The Secretary, the Editor and the Executive Officer shall be elected by the Council for terms to be fixed by the Council. (See By-Laws, Art. III.)

Section 2. The President of the Society shall preside at all business meetings of the Society. He shall be Chairman of the Council and of the Executive Committee. He shall perform all duties assigned him by the Society and the Council. In the event of his death, resignation, or absence except as otherwise provided in this Constitution, his duties shall devolve successively upon the Vice-President and the President-Elect.

ARTICLE V. OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

Section 1. The Society shall maintain a journal entitled the *American Sociological Review*. (See By-Laws, Art. IV.)

Section 2. The Society shall issue such other regular or occasional publications as it deems necessary in the promotion of its objectives.

ARTICLE VI. COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

Section 1. The Society shall constitute a Council from among its members who are eligible to vote. The Council shall be the permanent governing body of the Society, except insofar as the Society delegates governmental functions to officers or to other committees independent of or in cooperation with the Council.

Section 2. The Council shall consist of the President, the President-Elect, the Vice-President, the Vice-President-Elect, the Secretary, the Editor of the *American Sociological Review*, past presidents for the first three consecutive years after completion of their respective terms as President, representatives of regional or affiliated groups, a minimum of twelve elected members, and such other members of the Society as may be prescribed in the By-Laws. With the exception of *ex officio* members of the Council the term of membership shall be three years, and approximately one-third of the members are to be elected each year.

Section 3. The Council shall be responsible for the formulation of policy and the general direction of the affairs of the Society, and shall call regular and special meetings of the Society. It shall have the power to fill vacancies in its elective membership occasioned by death, resignation, or failure to elect, such appointees to hold office until the next annual meeting. Vacancies among the representatives of affiliated societies shall be filled by the societies affected.

Section 4. One-third of the total membership of the Council shall constitute a quorum at meetings, and a majority vote of those members in attendance shall control its decisions. When the Council is not in session, questions may be submitted by mail to its members for vote; a simple majority of those responding shall control decisions on such questions. However, no vote of the Council shall be binding unless the majority vote includes at least one-third of the total membership of the Council.

Section 5. The Council shall constitute from among its members an Executive Committee which shall have continuing responsibility for the implementation of the policies and programs

established by the Society or the Council. The Executive Committee shall have all the powers of the Council when the Council is not in session subject to such general directions and instructions as the Council may give, and the Executive Committee shall make regular reports of its activities to the Council.

Section 6. The Executive Committee shall consist of the President, Vice-President, President-Elect, Vice-President-Elect, the retired President for the first year after his term of office, the Secretary, the Editor of the *American Sociological Review* and four members to be elected from the Council, by the Council, two of whom are to be elected each year for a two-year term.

Section 7. The Society and the Council may establish such committees as may be necessary for the conduct of the Society's affairs.

ARTICLE VII. MEETINGS

Section 1. The Society shall hold at least one meeting each year, at a time and place to be determined by the Council. At each annual meeting there shall be at least one general meeting of the membership at which the Officers and the Council shall report to the Society and any business of the Society may be transacted.

ARTICLE VIII. SPECIAL FUNDS AND ENDOWMENTS

Section 1. The Society may solicit and receive special funds and endowments. Expenditure of such funds shall be authorized only by the Council.

ARTICLE IX. AMENDMENTS

Section 1. The Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds affirmative vote of those voting in a referendum submitted by mail to the voting members of the Society.

Section 2. Amendments may be proposed by the Council, or by petition of at least 50 voting members of the Society, or by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting at a business meeting of the Society.

Section 3. All proposed amendments to the Constitution shall be communicated to the voting membership at least fifty days prior to the vote on the amendment.

BY-LAWS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP AND DUES

Section 1. The membership of the Society shall consist of the following classes: Fellows,

Active members, Associate members, and Student members. Each member shall have the right to attend all meetings of the Society, and

shall be entitled to one subscription to the *American Sociological Review* and to such other publications as the Council may decide.

Section 2. Active members shall have the right to vote. The dues shall be fifteen dollars per annum, payable in advance. To be eligible for Active membership an applicant must have:

- (a)—a Ph.D. or equivalent professional training in Sociology, or
- (b)—substantial professional achievement in Sociology, or
- (c) a Ph.D. or its equivalent or substantial professional achievement in a closely related field, provided that the applicant's interest and activities have sociological emphasis or implication.

Section 3. On completion of five years of Active membership, a member shall automatically become a Fellow, provided that those whose eligibility for Active membership rested upon criterion (c) above shall have major commitment to the field of Sociology. Others who have been Active members for five years may on request have their credentials for Fellowship reviewed by the Classification Committee. In addition to the rights of Active members, the Fellows alone shall be eligible for election to office, membership on the Council, and chairmanships of standing committees. The dues shall be twenty dollars per annum, payable in advance.

Section 4. Registered undergraduate and graduate students in residence at educational institutions who have not completed all requirements for the Ph.D. degree and who are sponsored by a member of the Society may be admitted to Student membership in the Society for a period not to exceed five years. The dues shall be six dollars per annum, payable in advance. A Student member shall have the rights and privileges specified in Article I, Section 1, above.

Section 5. Any member of the Society may become a Donor by the payment of fifty dollars or more per annum.

Section 6. Any Fellow or Active member of the Society when retired by his institution, provided that he has paid dues to the Society continuously for at least twenty years, may become an Emeritus member of the Society. An Emeritus member pays no dues but shall have all the rights and privileges of his last class of membership.

Section 7. Any person interested in study, teaching, research or practice in Sociology, or in closely related fields of scientific interest, may be admitted to Associate membership in the Society upon payment in advance of twelve dollars per annum. An Associate member shall

have the rights and privileges specified in Article I, Section 1, above.

Section 8. Joint membership in the categories for which they are respectively eligible may be taken out by a husband and wife. The dues shall be those of the husband or wife alone, whichever are the higher, plus an additional two dollars. Both members shall have all the rights and privileges of their respective classes of membership in the Society, provided that they shall together be entitled to one subscription to the Society's publication(s) as specified in Article I, Section 1, above.

Section 9. Decisions concerning eligibility for membership in any class shall be made by the Classification Committee.

Section 10. Upon the failure to pay annual dues, the privileges of membership in the Society, including subscriptions to the Society's publication(s) and the right to vote, shall be suspended on June 1, and membership shall be terminated on December 31 of the year following the last full-year payment of dues.

Section 11. An application for membership received prior to October 1 in any year shall be dated back to January 1 of that year, and publications of the Society for the current year shall be sent to the member. An application for membership received on or after October 1 shall be dated forward to January 1 of the next year and all subsequent issues of the *Review* for the current year shall be sent to the member gratis. Student memberships, however, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be for a 12-month period beginning with the start of the academic year.

ARTICLE II. ELECTIONS AND VOTING

Section 1. All officers of the Society and members of the Council or Committees who are elected by the membership at large shall be elected by a mail ballot of the members qualified to vote. The term of office shall begin at the close of the annual meeting of the Society in the year during which they are elected. (See Article V, Sec. 1j of the By-Laws.)

Section 2a. The Committee on Nominations and Elections shall select two names each for the offices of President-Elect, Vice-President-Elect and for the one annual vacancy in the Committee on Publications. These names shall be placed on a ballot with one blank space for direct nominations from the membership for each position to be filled.

b. For the Council, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall select twice as many names as there are annual vacancies to be filled, and shall place these on the ballot with the

addition of as many blank spaces for direct membership nomination as there are vacancies to be filled.

c. These ballots shall be sent to the members eligible to vote by first class mail not later than May 15 of each year. To be valid as votes they must be returned to the Chairman of the Committee on Nominations and Elections by the date specified on the ballot, which shall be not less than 30 days from the date of mailing. Each member voting shall be required to place his signature upon the envelope in which the ballot is returned, but the election procedure shall preserve the anonymity of each ballot.

Section 3. Any properly qualified person whose name is written in for a particular office by at least one-tenth of those returning ballots, and in no case by less than twenty-five persons, shall be considered as nominated for that office, if such nominations are made on the first ballot. The Committee on Nominations and Elections shall then prepare a second ballot containing the names of the candidates for each of these offices, indicating which persons were nominated by the committee and which were nominated by the membership. This ballot shall be sent to the membership within thirty days after the close of receipt of the original ballots and shall be returnable to the Chairman of the Committee within thirty days of the date it was mailed.

Section 4. In case no names are written in for any office, or in the event that any name written in is found on less than one-tenth of the ballots returned, the results of the first ballot shall determine the election for that office.

Section 5. The candidate (or candidates when two or more vacancies are to be filled) receiving the largest number of votes shall be declared elected. In case of a tie vote the Chairman of the Committee shall decide by lot in the presence of the tellers between the tied candidates. In case of the death, resignation, or inability to serve of any person elected prior to the next annual meeting the candidate who had received the next highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

Section 6. The Chairman of the Committee shall appoint tellers to assist in the tabulation of the ballots.

Section 7. The Chairman of the Committee shall report the results of the ballot to the Secretary, and shall deposit in the Executive Office all ballots cast together with all pertinent data, and records of the Committee. The Executive Office shall hold the ballots and other materials submitted by the Committee in safe custody for a period of at least eighteen months.

Section 8. The report of the Committee

shall be published and distributed to the membership before the annual meeting.

Section 9. By direction of the Council or the Executive Committee, mail ballots, other than elections, may be conducted by the Executive Office in a manner to be specified by the Council or the Executive Committee.

Section 10. The Secretary shall record the results of all voting by the Society.

Section 11. The business meetings of the Society shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's *Rules of Order*.

ARTICLE III. OFFICERS

Section 1. The Secretary shall record the transactions of the Society, the Council, and the Executive Committee, shall work closely with various committees as herein specified, and shall perform such other duties as the Council may assign to him.

Section 2. The Editor of the *American Sociological Review* shall perform those duties as specified under Article IV of these By-Laws and shall undertake such other functions as may be assigned to him by the Council.

Section 3. The Executive Officer shall be responsible for the management of the Society's central office; shall receive, have custody of, and disburse the funds of the Society, subject to the By-Laws and the rules and orders of the Council; shall have jurisdiction over and attend to the business details of the Society's publications within the budget authorized; and shall function to facilitate the general work of the Society and its Committees. He shall be responsible, through the President, to the Council. He shall be a non-voting member of the Executive Committee and the Council, with responsibility under the President for the preparation of agenda for the meetings.

ARTICLE IV. PUBLICATIONS

Section 1. All the publications of the Society shall be under the general direction of the Publications Committee, subject to the approval of the Council.

Section 2. The Board of Editors of the *American Sociological Review* shall be composed of an Editor, the Executive Officer, and not less than six Associate Editors, to be elected by the Council for three-year terms, at least two of which shall expire each year. The number of Associate Editors beyond six shall be determined by the Council. The Editor and Associate Editors, who are subject to re-election if the Council desires, shall be selected with a view to technical competence, and, with respect to the Associate Editors, an adequate distribu-

tion of specific fields of competence. The Editor shall be Chairman of the Board.

Section 3. The Editor of *Sociometry* shall be elected by the Council for a term to be fixed by the Council. He shall serve *ex officio* as a member of the Council.

Section 4. The Board of Editors of *Sociometry* shall be composed of an Editor and not less than ten Associate Editors. The Associate Editors shall be elected by the Council from nominations made by the Editor and the Council. They are subject to re-election on the recommendation of the Editor. They shall serve three-year terms, at least three of which shall expire each year. The Editor shall be Chairman of the Board.

Section 5. The composition and methods of selecting the Board(s) of Editors for any additional publication(s) shall be determined by the Council, provided that the Secretary and Executive Officer shall be members of the Board for whatever publication is to carry the reports of the Society's official business.

Section 6. The Editor of each of the official publications of the Society shall be responsible for the editorial management of the publication. He shall have the authority to appoint such contributing, book review or special-issue editors as he may deem necessary. He must work within the policies established by the Committee on Publications, and within the budget as approved by the Council.

Section 7. In the event that the Society issues any publication in addition to the *Review*, the Council shall determine, on the recommendation of the Committee on Publications, the most appropriate means of publication of official news and notes, and matters pertaining to the business affairs of the Society.

Section 8. The Editor shall have the right to reject for publication any paper or other communication submitted to him.

ARTICLE V. COMMITTEES

Section 1. The Council.

a. The Council may create such temporary committees of its own or of the Society, not provided in the Constitution, as may seem useful for promoting the work of the Society.

b. All motions presented at business meetings for the creation of new committees affecting the policy of the Society shall be referred to the Council for its recommendation. The Council shall report its recommendation concerning such motions at the next business meeting of the Society.

c. The Council shall hold at least one meeting in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Society.

d. The Council shall elect the Secretary, the Editor of the *American Sociological Review*, the Editor(s) of any other publication(s) which the Society may establish, and the Executive Officer.

e. The Council may make decisions to cooperate with other societies and associations, and shall elect representatives from this Society to such other societies or associations.

f. All action of the Executive Committee and the Council of continuing significance must be reported to the Society.

g. Actions taken by the membership present and voting at an annual business meeting shall be binding upon the Council, provided that the Council may, within four months of such a meeting, submit to mail referendum of the members of the Society any action taken at an annual meeting. The results of such a referendum shall supersede the action taken at the annual meeting.

h. In time of war or other national emergency the Council may suspend the holding of annual meetings or other regular activities of the Society when such action is deemed to be in accord with the national interest.

i. In the event of the suspension of the annual meeting, all actions of the Council or its Executive Committee which would normally be reported to the Society for its approval shall be communicated to the members in an official publication of the Society, and shall form a part of the Official Proceedings of the Society unless and until revised by action of the Society.

j. In the event of the suspension of the annual meeting, newly elected officers, members of the Council and others elected by the Society or the Council shall take office at the time determined by the Council and, in any event, not later than January 1 following the election.

Section 2.

a. The Executive Committee shall meet on the call of the President or on the written request of three of its members.

b. Five members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum at meetings, and a majority vote of the members in attendance shall control its decisions.

c. When the Committee is not in session questions may be submitted to the members for vote; a simple majority of those responding shall control decisions on such questions.

Section 3.

a. There shall be a Committee on Publications, consisting of the President, the Secretary, the Editor of the *Review*, the editor(s) of other publication(s), the Executive Officer and a minimum of three other members elected by

the membership of the Society for three-year terms, provided that during the first year one shall be elected for a one-year term, one for a two-year term, and the other for a three-year term.

b. The Publications Committee shall be responsible for policy on all publications of the Society. All proposals for the establishment of a new publication or for major modifications in an existing publication of the Society shall be subject to the approval of the Council.

Section 4. The President of the Society shall annually appoint a Committee on Nominations and Elections consisting of fifteen members. The Committee shall be broadly representative of the membership of the Society, taking into account the fields of specialization and the geographical distribution of the members. Not less than four nor more than five of the members shall be continued from the Committee of the previous year.

Section 5. Each year the Council shall select the Program Committee for the annual meeting to be held two years later. The Committee shall consist of the incoming President-Elect, the Vice-President-Elect, the Secretary, and two members of the Society elected by the Council for two-year terms.

Section 6. The Council shall elect from among the voting members of the Society a Classification Committee of three members for three-year terms, one member to be elected each year. The Committee shall recommend to the Executive Committee criteria for the classification of memberships in accordance with the standards set out in Article I of these By-Laws; in consultation with the Secretary devise procedures for passing upon future applications for membership; review the criteria in use from time to time with a view to recommending to the Council the application of higher standards as the standards of sociological training improve and the number of well trained sociologists increases, and exercise the powers specified in Article I of these By-Laws.

Section 7. The Council shall appoint a Committee on Training and Professional Standards to serve for three-year terms, with one-third of the terms expiring each year. This Committee shall retain under constant review the standards for the profession as a whole. The Committee shall study current standards for professional training and research and from time to time submit its findings to the Council with recommendations.

Section 8. The Council shall appoint a Committee on Budget and Investment to serve for three-year terms, with one-third of the terms expiring each year. The Chairman of the Committee shall be a member of the

Executive Committee, provided that the President, the Editor of the *Review* and the Executive Officer shall not be appointed as Chairman of this Committee. The Committee in co-operation with the President, the Executive Officer, and the Editor of the *Review*, shall annually propose to the Council a budget for the ensuing year. At the end of the first half of each fiscal year it shall review the receipts and expenditures to date and if necessary make recommendations for adjustments in the budget. It shall supervise the investment and banking activities of the Society and shall have the responsibility and the authority for the investment and the reinvestment of funds owned by or held by the Society. (See Article VI of these By-Laws.)

Section 9. The Council shall annually appoint a Resolutions Committee. All resolutions shall be referred to this Committee before submission to the vote of the Society. This Committee reports to the Council.

Section 10. A Committee on Research shall be appointed by the President to serve for three-year terms, with one-third of the terms expiring each year. This Committee shall have specific responsibility for the planning and promotion of the research activities of the Society.

Section 11. The President shall annually appoint a Membership Committee, whose members shall be selected from the various geographic areas of the Country. The function of this Committee is the solicitation of membership in the Society.

Section 12. The President shall annually appoint a Committee on Public Relations which shall work with the Secretary and the Executive Officer in publicizing the activities of the Society and in conducting relations with the Press.

Section 13. Each committee must work within the budget as approved by the Council.

Section 14. Any group of members may organize a Section of the Society, based on a common interest in a substantive field within Sociology, in accordance with the requirements stated in the following section of the By-Laws.

Section 15. Application for recognition as a Section may be made to the Council if the applying group has at least 200 members agreeing to subscribe to the Society a mailing fee of \$1 each year, and chooses a committee for the Section for the purpose of cooperating with the Program Committee in planning the presentation of its field of interest in the annual meeting of the Society. The Council shall have the power of according or withholding recognition to any Section, and may discontinue a Section at any time.

Section 16. An officially recognized Section shall be entitled to cooperation from the Execu-

tive Office in matters of mailings to its members, and from the Program Committee in matters related to the annual meeting, and from the Society in such other ways as the Council may decide.

ARTICLE VI. BUDGET AND FINANCE

Section 1. A budget for the ensuing fiscal year covering all expenditures of the Society, including the cost of publications, shall be submitted by the Committee on Budget and Investment to the Council for approval. Proposals for changes in the budget shall likewise be submitted to the Council by the Committee except that small interim changes (not to exceed \$100 in any budget category) may be authorized by the Executive Committee on the recommendation of the Budget Committee.

Section 2. This budget shall be binding upon the Executive Officer.

Section 3. A bond in the amount of ten thousand dollars, the cost of which is borne by the Society, shall be required of the Executive Officer or other officer or appointee handling the funds of the Society.

Section 4. The accounts of the Society shall be audited at the conclusion of each fiscal year by a certified public accountant approved by the Council. The report of this audit shall be published to the members of the Society.

ARTICLE VII. RELATION TO REGIONAL AND OTHER AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Section 1. Regional sociological societies whose membership is recruited from two or more states, and other national societies concerned with specialized phases or applications of sociology, may affiliate with the American Sociological Society upon approval by a majority of the members of the American Sociological Society voting. Each affiliated society shall be entitled to one representative on the Council of the Society.

Section 2. Each affiliated society is free to designate its representative to the Council in its own manner provided that the representa-

tive shall be a Fellow of the American Sociological Society.

Section 3. In the event that an affiliated organization meets at the same time and place as the American Sociological Society, the program of the affiliated organization shall be coordinated with that of the Society insofar as is possible.

Section 4. In the event that the Council finds that the conditions of affiliation are not being fulfilled by any affiliated organization, or that such affiliation is no longer to the best interests of the American Sociological Society, the Council may recommend to the Society a termination of the affiliation. Such termination shall require approval by a majority of the members of the American Sociological Society voting.

Section 5. Affiliated organizations shall be entitled to the opportunity to publish notices of their activities in the publications of the Society, and to such services by the Executive Office of the Society as the Council may determine.

Section 6. Affiliated societies, which were accepted as such prior to January 1, 1951, shall be eligible to continue as such, subject to the provisions of Section 4 of this Article.

ARTICLE VIII. AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Amendments to these By-Laws may be proposed by any member of the Society, and adoption shall require a majority vote of the members present and voting at any annual meeting of the Society, provided that no action shall be taken until the amendment has been read and has lain on the table until a subsequent business meeting.

Section 2. The Council may, upon two-thirds vote of its members, submit amendments to the By-Laws to the members of the Society by mail ballot, provided that such amendments have been communicated to the membership at least thirty days prior to the vote on the amendment. Such amendments shall be adopted upon a two-thirds affirmative vote of the members voting.

THE NEED FOR NATIONWIDE MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE STATISTICS: COMMENT

THOMAS P. MONAHAN

The Municipal Court of Philadelphia

The chief purpose of the report on "The Need for Nationwide Marriage and Divorce Statistics" (*American Sociological Review*, 23 [June, 1958]) was to give scholarly expression to the "sociological implications" of the need for, and

the value of these data.¹ It was also intended that this publication would help to "sell" a program of state registration and national statistics to budgetary and other persons in public office.

This report, I believe, departed from its title and purpose, being largely a compilation of procedural, technical, and "role" problems intermingled with *selected* historical items, almost all of which are available in the bibliography

¹ Council Minutes, *American Sociological Review*, 22 (December, 1956), p. 751, item 12-5.

appended herewith. The following commentary is merely an attempt to clarify some of the issues raised concerning adequate registration and statistics of marriage and divorce.

The collection of data for the first two nationwide reports on marriage and divorce was instigated by a theologian, the Reverend Samuel W. Dike, and the New England Divorce Reform League, whose dynamic influence aroused the support of persons in high office, including President Theodore Roosevelt. Since 1906, however, this field of statistics has languished and sociologists, unlike the reform group, have shown little disposition to rally as a profession in the cause, although they have the major interest in these data. "The United States is one of the few civilized nations which lack a program of detailed statistics on marriages and divorces."²

There are several reasons for this situation. No issue exists as to the delegation of constitutional responsibility for the collection of information, even though some consensus should be reached regarding the items viewed as essential for recording in all states. The Census Bureau, in fact, attempted to collect marriage data directly in decennial censuses as early as 1850; and, although the law was not explicit on the matter, the Vital Statistics Division of the Bureau made a real effort, however small, to collect original nationwide returns and, on such a basis, to prepare tables on marriages and divorces in the period 1922-1932. It renewed such a program with cooperating states in 1939 and 1940.

Sociologists as a professional group are partly responsible for the present situation because of failure to make their legitimate interests in the data felt by those who determine the scope of the work of the Census Bureau and the National Office of Vital Statistics in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (A different interest group, in contrast, has succeeded by special legislation in having the Census Bureau "directed" to collect data on red-cedar shingles.³) Even today, as various items recorded in the business minutes of the American Sociological Society show, small pride should be taken by sociologists in their present role. The Society passed a resolution calling for Congressional support in 1947, but did almost nothing further until 1954 when the Council acted upon a reiterated resolution and named

a committee on marriage and divorce statistics.⁴ Whether or not "sociologists are listened to," the national committees have accomplished very little during the past three years to help the development of a nationwide system of state registration of marriages and divorces.

That sociologists can "go it alone" regarding the development of adequate divorce registration is doubtful. One proposal has been made that a National Interprofessional Committee be formed, sponsored by the American Sociological Society. Such groups as the Council of State Governments (an agency of state governors concerned with interstate problems and uniform legislation), the American Bar Association, the National Council on Family Relations, the American Public Health Association, the American Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the American Association of Registration Executives, and others could be represented in such a committee. The Society's marriage and divorce committee of 1955-56 approved the idea of a National Interprofessional Committee, but subsequently shifted its preference to a state-by-state or regional sociological approach. This approach has until now achieved very little. Moreover, although the Eastern Sociological Society maintained a committee on this problem until 1957, here too nothing of significance was accomplished. In short, a large share of the responsibility for the poor state of these statistics derives from the lack of active concern and of a realistic view by sociologists themselves. In speaking of recent developments in the field of public health statistics in 1950, Dr. H. L. Dunn, Chief of the National Office of Vital Statistics, cited the work of six professional groups, but he did not mention the American Sociological Society.⁵

Another reason for the absence of adequate nationwide data is found in the inheritance of this field of statistics by state departments of health. The latter, in recent years, have been less interested in social demographic matters than they were 100 years ago. Historically, births, marriages, and deaths were a concern of registration and vital statistics, and, as they became more frequent, divorces were added. But departments of health have been principally, if not exclusively, oriented to problems

² Inter-Agency Committee, Report on Background Materials for the National Conference on Family Life, May 1948, *The American Family, A Factual Background*, Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1949, p. 37.

³ *United States Code, 1952*, Title 13, Sect. 94 (Cf., Sect. 101, 245).

⁴ *American Sociological Review* 13 (April, 1948), pp. 205-207; 14 (February, 1949), pp. 135-136; 17 (December, 1952), p. 774; 18 (December, 1953), pp. 675, 679; 20 (February, 1955), pp. 88, 106; 20 (December, 1955), pp. 719, 720, 738-739; 21 (December, 1956), pp. 751-753, 755, 762-763, 771-772; 22 (December, 1957), pp. 741-742, 755.

⁵ Halbert L. Dunn, "Recent Developments in the Field of Public Health Statistics," *American Journal of Public Health*, 40 (June, 1950), p. 665.

of sanitation, epidemiology, morbidity, and conditions of birth, death, and biological living. With this orientation, demographic data on marriages and divorces became of little concern. Furthermore, divorce was primarily a legal and not a health issue. Thus most medical commissioners and health officers did not push the development of these data. Nor was the collection of data on marriage and divorce encouraged by preoccupation with biological events in the Census Bureau and, latterly, the Public Health Service. In budgeting and in other ways, births and deaths came first. As Dr. Dunn has said, "The National Office is not free to direct personnel and funds from its 'bread and butter' tasks,"—for marriage and divorce statistics.⁶ From about 1950 until recently, the staff of NOVS engaged in the marriage and divorce branch included only two people. The present limited program of NOVS, unlike its procedure with births and deaths, relies upon each state for the preparation of tables on marriage and divorce. Whether or not this subject matter has ever received a full hearing or more than token support within the federal agency(s) responsible for the development of these data remains a question.

The neglect of statistics on divorce can be attributed in part to the legal profession, for this basic information is a by-product of the judicial system. Court clerks and lawyers must be convinced of the need for registering detailed information on divorce. Frequently they express disinterest in providing face-sheet divorce information on personal and social factors, their primary concern being the entitlement to a divorce. Finally, since most marriage and divorce registration requirements are written into law, legislators (many of whom are lawyers) must be persuaded that this additional governmental activity is valuable, indeed essential, in spite of its cost.

In appraising the present situation it should be noted that the idea of Registration Areas for marriages and divorces was broached over eighteen years ago, and that the standard records (less complete than some earlier models) were ten years in the making. Furthermore, both the number of items on the standard forms and the number of states cited as having a central registration procedure may be misleading. Only 29 states qualified for admission to the Marriage Registration Area in 1957, and only 14 states for the Divorce Registration Area in 1958, although exceptions were granted to certain so-called "minimum" or required items on the standard forms by NOVS. States are admitted to the MRA with missing items, for example,

occupation, in the standard marriage record. In the case of Ohio, the "minimum" race-or-color item was waived for marriages. Prior marriages in divorce registration were not required for other states in the DRA. The standard record of divorce, moreover, does not request date of separation, the nature of prior marital status, and other important variables. The MRA and DRA thus represent efforts to initiate a national program, to be sure, but with limited procedures which do not yet measure up to scientific adequacy.

If a satisfactory nationwide program of marriage and divorce statistics is to be achieved in the near future, the profession of sociology should have the following objectives:

1. Recognition by the Society of its professional responsibility for the improvement and development of this field of statistics.
2. Earnest support of continuous, planned, and practical activities to attain this goal, including committee work.
3. Preparation and publication of a document explaining the social and scientific value of statistics on marriage and divorce, written in direct, forceful, and meaningful language so as to persuade those who can influence or bring about this program.
4. Assembly by the Society of a National Inter-professional Committee, whether or not financial support is forthcoming, the aims of which should be to foster understanding of and demand for statistics on marriage and divorce and to find specific ways, legislatively or otherwise, to activate the program.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY (LISTED CHRONOLOGICALLY)

- Samuel W. Dike, "The Conditions and Needs of Statistics of Marriage and Divorce," *Publications of the American Statistical Association*, III (December, 1893), pp. 513-518.
- John S. Strahorn, "A Lawyer's View of Vital Statistics," *American Journal of Public Health*, 27 (December, 1937), pp. 1207-1215.
- H. L. Dunn, "Plans for Vital Statistics in 1940," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 35 (March, 1940), pp. 86-92.
- National Office of Vital Statistics, "Tentative Plans for the Collection of Marriage and Divorce Statistics," *Vital Statistics Special Reports*, Vol. 9, No. 42 (1940), pp. 491-495.
- B. M. Cohen, "Centralized Collection of Marriage and Divorce Records and Their Uses," *American Journal of Public Health*, 31 (August, 1941), pp. 824-828; republished in *Vital Statistics Special Reports*, Vol. 12, No. 34 (1941), pp. 595-601.
- Samuel C. Newman, "Needs and Future Prospects for Integrating Marriage and Divorce Data With Other Vital Statistics," *American Journal of Public Health*, 39 (September, 1949), pp. 1141-1144.
- , "Trends in Vital Statistics of Marriages and Divorces in the United States," *Marriage and*

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 668.

- Family Living*, 12 (August, 1950), pp. 89-90.
- National Office of Vital Statistics, *Vital Statistics of the United States*, United States Government Printing Office: Washington, D. C.: Vol. 1, 1950, pp. 2-19, "History and Organization of the United States Vital Statistics System;" Vol. 1, 1955, pp. xv-xvi, xxx, xxxiv, Standard records and maps.
- Hugh Carter and Sarah Lewit, "Marriage Statistics In the United States: Development and Current Plans," *Estadistica*, 11 (June, 1953), pp. 475-484.
- Thomas P. Monahan, "State Registration of Marriage and Divorce Records," *The Spotlight* (Tennessee Department of Public Health), 9 (January, February, 1955).
- Hugh Carter, "National Marriage and Divorce Statistics—Progress Report, 1945-1955," *Public Health Reports*, 70 (April, 1955), pp. 347-351.
- H. L. Dunn, "Teamwork and Changing Concepts in Vital Statistics," *Vital Statistics Special Reports*, Vol. 45, No. 8 (1956), pp. 103-111.
- U. S. National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, "National Vital Statistics Needs," *Public Health Reports*, 72 (June, 1957), pp. 559-563.
- Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics, *Documents* (not distributed publicly).

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE THIRD INDIAN SOCIOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

MARGARET E. SHAY

Dacca, East Pakistan

Some seventy to eighty delegates from colleges, universities, institutes, and schools of social work throughout India, as well as several foreign observers, assembled on February 6th, 7th, and 8th, for the Third Indian Sociological Conference at Agra University's Institute of Social Sciences. Although the third of its kind since 1955, it was the first Conference to be held in the newly-born Institute, impressive both for its architecture and atmosphere of scholarship.

In the opening session, the spotlight was focussed upon the sociologist of India, exposing the gravity of his responsibilities against a backdrop of rapid social change. His role was delineated as a composite of "social critic" and "social engineer," dedicated to the development of "precise and scientific procedures that will yield stable empirical results." This orientation, linked to pride in the fact that sociological thinking has its roots in ancient India, combines a realistic insight into the immediate with a sensitivity for historical continuity, that should distinguish future sociology in India.

In the thirty-odd papers and addresses which were read and discussed in the sectional meetings on Social Psychology, Sociology, Social Anthropology, and Social Statistics and Demog-

raphy, consciousness of the impact of social change was uppermost. The significant areas of discussion, viewed against this recurrent awareness, fell into two categories: methodological practices and problems; and empirical studies relating to the psycho-social consequences of changing forces.

Dr. Radhakamal Mukerjee in his Presidential Address set the keynote for the first category—the need for greater integration of the social sciences. Specific recommendations included: (1) an appeal for less interdepartmental friction and compartmentalization in academic institutions; (2) recognition of the fact that the cooperation of each discipline is indispensable to an understanding of the whole situation, and that stress should be upon social, rather than sociological research, upon social problems, rather than strictly sociological or economic problems; (3) advocacy of the establishment of a social science research center with the objective of analyzing social problems in their entirety; (4) consideration of the possibility that the reputation of sociologists will be enhanced, both as a particular group and as members of social science teams, proportionate to their skill in attacking the nation's numerous, harassing social problems; (5) fostering of teaching methods which would insure a broader, humanistic base of training, avoidance of overspecialization at the expense of narrowness of outlook, and better coordination in the classroom between the theoretical and the practical; and (6) a plea for closer collaboration between statistically-trained sociologists and sociologically-trained statisticians.

The second major division, devoted to empirical studies of the psycho-social results of rapid change, particularly the session on Social Psychology, showed genuine concern for the effect of India's growing industrialization upon the traditional value system. Essentially, the problem is one of reconciling the demands of industrialization with the values of an ancient culture, the resolution of which may be compromise through selectivity or substantial rejection of the past in the search for a new synthesis. In either event the future of the Indian people is being challenged in a sphere in which the social scientist realizes that he should give active direction.

Self-analysis was again reflected in the discussion of "National Character and the Concept of Modal Personality in India." This paper suggested that the people of India, despite great sub-cultural differences, have evolved a distinctive way of life and a set of modal personality traits. Whether such national identifiability, however, here or elsewhere, can sustain historical changes which may alter these so-called "rela-

tively enduring personality characteristics" was seriously questioned.

Most of the addresses and papers in the sections on Sociology and Social Anthropology were studies of the effect of democratization and innovation upon village life, the joint family, and the caste structure. All agreed that in the wake of independence, India is seeing the power-structure of its villages, moulded from caste and feudalistic traditions, cracking under the strain of democratization and urbanization; the joint family giving way to the more individualistic type, through economic pressures; and the caste structure gradually breaking down as social distance begins to be reduced. But it was generally acknowledged that the rate of change was not so fast-paced as to induce radical transformations overnight. The conviction was expressed, that despite moves for the abolition of the caste system, it will be perpetuated as long as the upper castes, especially, have vested interests in casteism.

In summary, the social scientists of India in this conference demonstrated, not only that they are conversant with current trends in Europe and America, but that they are determined to weld the best of the West and the East in their zeal to contribute towards solutions of the social problems of changing India.

"INFORMAL SOCIOLOGY": A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW PUBLICATION *

HERBERT J. GANS
University of Pennsylvania

Sociologists, like other social scientists, communicate with *formal* and *informal* statements. Formal statements present substantive materials within the framework of the discipline's methodology, and include primarily research reports, as well as systematic theoretical and conceptual analyses, operationally defined hypotheses, etc. Informal statements sacrifice methodological considerations for more intensive exploration of substantive materials, and include broad generalizations based on illustrative rather than demonstrative evidence, new hypotheses and approaches stated in pre-empirical terms, discussions of topics on which empirical research is not yet possible, general evaluations of ideas and methods, and speculative essays.

Formal statements are published in a variety of well-institutionalized ways. Informal ones are less frequently published, and are communicated

* This discussion was aided by helpful comments from several persons, especially Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr.

mainly in seminars and lectures, and such less public means as discussions at meetings of sociologists, faculty gatherings and class rooms. The lack of sufficient public means for the communication of what may be called "informal sociology" thus deprives the field of information about a particular kind of creative activity. This paper therefore proposes a new journal devoted expressly to informal sociology.

The existing sociological journals—like those of other sciences—must devote themselves primarily to formal statements, in order to present the products of research to colleagues (including those wielding the power of promotion), sponsors of research, and the more general public. In their contents, the journals often strive to achieve what might be called a "scientific performance," a systematic, finished presentation that seeks, among other things, to demonstrate the scientific nature of the discipline to its audience.¹ This emphasis results in part from the continuing need to persuade influential persons in the audience of the scientific character of contemporary sociology.

The requirements of the scientific performance, however, are accompanied by a number of disadvantages. First, the publication of informal statements is minimized. Second, internal criticism of current works and ideas is restricted, conflicting as it does with the primary aim of presenting achievements. Third, emphasis on the finished product means that publication of sponsored research is emphasized, at the expense of topics not susceptible to systematic study, and those for which sponsorship is not available. For example, sociological analyses of world problems have been relatively few, and the existence of crucial East-West conflicts would scarcely be evident from a reading of most of the journals. Similarly, analyses of McCarthyism by American sociologists some years ago appeared mainly in literary reviews, and in the *British Journal of Sociology*.

These observations are not meant to criticize existing journals, but to suggest that they cannot fill all needed communication functions. Some of these functions are satisfied by such publications as the *Antioch Review*, *Commentary*, *Dissent*, and the *Yale Law Review*. The sociological analyses they publish, however, often cannot meet the special needs of the professional sociologist. The Canadian journal *Explorations* publishes informal statements of the kind noted above, but limits itself to the spheres defined by its subtitle, "Studies in Culture and Communication."

¹ Performance is used here as defined by Erving Goffman, *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Edinburgh: Social Science Research Centre, 1956, Chapter 1.

Therefore, it is proposed that a new sociological journal be established, with perhaps the following six types of content:

1. Presentations of provocative hypotheses. This category should solicit discussions of the hunches which most sociologists frequently develop, but which they usually put aside because of other commitments and publication incentives.

2. Reconnaissance studies that may lead to fruitful broad generalizations. More such generalizations need to be published and discussed, even if they can presently be supported only by illustrative "evidence."

3. Sociological analyses of current events and trends. The use of sociological concepts in the interpretation of journalistic data about local, national and world phenomena would make it possible to show the latent social forces at work in the manifest behavior of public agencies and leaders.

4. Observations of phenomena and trends in American society and culture. Formal research has not been able to deal with more than a small fraction of the quickly changing culture of our times. Since every sociologist works and lives in this culture, on-the-spot observations of new fads and fashions, mass media themes and the like would add to the record of what Everett Hughes calls urban ethnology. In the hands of a skillful analyst, such reports can serve as raw material for broader generalizations about American life.

5. Commentaries and critiques of all phases of sociological practice. Manifest and latent tendencies in current research and writing need to be evaluated in much greater detail than now possible. Regular articles, and ongoing discussions, perhaps in the form of letters and rejoinders, could make the journal a platform for an extensive and continuing debate.

6. Speculative sociological essays on any subject. Since an empirical sociology has been safely achieved, it seems desirable to restore parts of the older European and American essayistic tradition.

The proposed journal is conceived as one of the professional publications of sociology, but should be open to others interested in informal analysis, whatever their affiliations. The mood and format of the journal should be such that contributors are encouraged to discuss ideas and to stimulate, rather than to present formal findings. Despite the "informality" of its contents, the journal should nevertheless maintain at least the same standards of intellectual quality and workmanship as existing journals. Its editorial policy should be developed in conjunction with that of present publications, so as to develop clear distinctions be-

tween formal and informal sociology, and to prevent non-professional readers of sociological materials from confusing the findings of systematic research with the insights of a speculative essay.

The founding of a new journal is a time consuming and costly project. Consequently, some evidence of the existence of potential contributors and readers—and of their level of enthusiasm—is desirable before the idea is formally presented to the Publications Committee of the Society, or some outside sponsor. Expressions of interest are therefore solicited, as are comments about the proposed functions and contents of the journal, suggestions for additional ones, and ideas for implementing the proposal.²

CAN WE DEVELOP A PROGRAM OF RECRUITMENT?

CLAUDE C. BOWMAN

Temple University

In recent months there has been a great deal of public clamor about the need to attract talented youth into the physical sciences and well-financed programs are getting under way. It would seem that, as a measure of self-protection, the social sciences are now compelled to develop their own plans for recruitment (with aid from the foundations and other sources). Surely the deficiencies of a nationwide program of teaching and research that promotes the physical sciences at the expense of the social sciences are apparent to all of us.

College teachers in daily contact with undergraduates are in a favorable position to interest superior students in sociology as a professional career. Many now treat the matter casually but they might make a special effort if given the proper stimulation to do so. The cumulative effect of several thousand individual and departmental efforts in this direction could be considerable.

In my opinion this whole problem should have an important place on the agenda of the American Sociological Society and of the regional societies. It merits extensive discussion in our publications too. Recruitment for the social sciences cannot be dismissed as self-serving in purpose. It concerns the fundamental adequacy of education in a democratic society.

Can we formulate effective plans to insure a continual flow of talent into our field?

² These should be addressed to the author, Institute for Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, to the Editor of the *Review*, or both.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

International Review of Community Development. This new journal is being published bi-annually under the auspices of the International Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centres, with offices at Piazza Cavalieri di Malta, 2—Roma. Under the editorship of Albert Meister, the first issue is devoted to Community Centres.

International Sociological Association. The Fourth World Congress will be held in Perugia, Italy, in September 1959, provisionally set for September 8–15. The theme will be "Society and Sociological Knowledge."

The Superior School of Social Work, Athens, Greece, would appreciate donations of books in the social sciences, especially sociology and social psychology, to build up its library. The School is run on a volunteer basis and has no financial support from its sponsoring organization. Second-hand or new books may be sent to Mrs. Anne Potamianou-Pipinelli, general manager of the Superior Institute of Social Work, Royal National Institution, Notara Street 50, Athens, Greece.

American Association for the Advancement of Science. Section K, Social and Economic Sciences, will hold sessions for contributed papers at the annual meeting of the AAAS in Washington, D. C., December 26–31, 1958. Society members interested in presenting a paper at these sessions should forward titles and abstracts not later than October 10 to the secretary of Section K, Donald P. Ray, National Academy of Economics and Political Science, George Washington University, Washington 6, D. C. The American Sociological Society is an affiliate member of the Section on Social and Economic Sciences of the AAAS.

American Council of Learned Societies announces current Fellowship and Grant-in-Aid Programs. Fellowships are not to exceed 7,000 dollars for one-year projects beginning between July 1 and October 1, 1959; candidates must have the doctorate or its equivalent, be not over 45 years of age, and apply not later than October 15, 1958. Grants-in-Aid are also for a year and are not to exceed 2,000 dollars, but will be awarded to holders of the doctorate twice during the academic year 1958–59, applications to be judged in the first competition by December 1, 1958 and in the second by March 1, 1959. Sociologists may apply for both programs. Inquiries should be addressed to the ACLS, 345 East 46 Street, New York 17, New York.

Also announced recently was a grant of 500,000 dollars from the Ford Foundation for a program to encourage international scholarly congresses in the humanities and the social sciences to meet in the United States over a period of five to ten years. The grant will be administered by the ACLS in cooperation with the Social Science Research Council. Among leading international scholarly associations holding world congresses every three to five years to review developments in their fields of re-

search is the International Sociological Association. In addition to such regular congresses, the grant will also make possible the support of inter-disciplinary meetings concerned with specific problems or themes of interest to international scholarship.

Midwest Sociological Society. The annual meeting was held in Minneapolis on April 24–25, with the Department of Sociology of the University of Minnesota serving as host. A one-day joint session with the Society For the Study of Social Problems preceded the regular meeting. As guest speaker at the annual dinner, E. Franklin Frazier spoke on "The Underdeveloped Areas of the World as a Field of Sociological Research."

The President for 1958–1959 is Elio D. Monachesi of the University of Minnesota. George Vold, University of Minnesota, remains as representative to the American Sociological Society and Paul Campisi, Washington University (St. Louis) remains as editor of the *Midwest Sociologist*.

National Science Foundation. Among those receiving Fellowship Awards in Science for 1958–1959 are: Senior Postdoctoral Fellowships, Edward Norbeck (University of California), Anthropology, William Petersen (University of Colorado), Demography; Science Faculty Fellowships, Marcia J. Durham (Boston University and Northeastern University), Anthropology; Postdoctoral Fellowships, Stanley A. Freed (University of California), Anthropology, Kenneth L. Hale (Indiana University), Anthropology, Karl G. Heider (University of Vienna), Anthropology, Claire Jacobson (Columbia University), Anthropology, Joan Snyder (Cornell University), Anthropology; Predoctoral Fellowships, Lindsey Churchill, Jr. (Harvard University), Mathematical Sociology, Glen H. Cole (University of Chicago), Anthropology, Patrick Culbert (University of Chicago), Anthropology, James L. Gibbs, Jr. (Harvard University), Anthropology, Ruth Gruhn (Radcliffe College), Anthropology, Lucile E. Hoyme (University of Oxford), Anthropology, Carol Irwin (University of Michigan), Anthropology, Cynthia Irwin (Radcliffe College), Anthropology, Jonathan Jenness (Harvard University), Anthropology, Maxine R. Kleindienst (University of Chicago), Anthropology, Frank C. Miller (Harvard University), Anthropology, Karl E. Taeuber (Harvard University), Demography, Sidney R. Waldron (Johns Hopkins University), Anthropology, Patty J. Watson (University of Michigan), Anthropology, and Nahum J. Waxman (Cornell University), Anthropology.

At its meeting in March, the Chairman of the National Science Board announced the appointment of a Committee on Social Sciences consisting of the following: Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, President, University of Notre Dame, Chairman; Donald H. McLaughlin, President, Homestake Mining Company; Douglas M. Whitaker, Vice-President for Administration, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research; and Frederick A. Middlebush, President

Emeritus and Director of Development Fund, University of Missouri.

The next closing date for receipt of proposals in the Social Science Research Program is October 1, 1958. Proposals received by that date will be evaluated in the fall. Approved grants will be activated in time for work to begin in the second semester or the summer of 1959. Proposals received after October 1, 1958 will be reviewed following the winter closing date of February 1, 1959, with activation of approved grants in the summer and fall of 1959. Inquiries should be addressed to National Science Foundation, Washington 25, D. C.

Pacific Sociological Society announces publication of *The Pacific Sociological Review*, A Semi-Annual Journal of Sociology, the first issue which was published Spring, 1958. Communications should be addressed to 209 Commonwealth Hall, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Society for the History of Technology. In an effort to assess the impact of technology on society, a group of interested scholars have joined to form this new organization. It will sponsor meetings at which various aspects of technological history will be investigated and will publish a quarterly journal, *Technology and Culture*, devoted to the study of the development of technology and its relations with society and culture. The Executive Committee includes, among others, Melvin Kranzberg, Chairman, Case Institute of Technology, William Fielding Ogburn, University of Chicago, and Lynn White, Jr., Mills College. Included among the members of the Advisory Council are Bert Loewenberg, Sarah Lawrence College, Robert K. Merton, Columbia University, Lewis Mumford, Amenia, New York, and David Riesman, University of Chicago. Address inquiries to Professor Melvin Kranzberg, Room 315, Main Building, Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland 6, Ohio.

Alfred University. Roland L. Warren, Professor and Chairman of the Department, assumed the position of Director of the new Community Study Service of the State Charities Aid Association in July. The new program, made possible through the assistance of Russell Sage Foundation, will aid local citizens groups to gather and analyze data essential to the furthering of community services, especially in regard to changing needs in health and welfare. During the past year Warren was engaged in a special project on Voluntary Citizen Activities in Stuttgart, Germany, under a fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation.

Arizona State College. Clarence Ray Jeffery of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology has been appointed a Senior Fellow in the Law and Behavioral Science program at the University of Chicago. He will be on leave of absence during the 1958-59 academic year. Kenneth Stewart has been promoted to the rank of Professor for the academic year 1958-59. Lester S. Perril has assumed the chairmanship this year.

Bates College. Peter P. Jonitis is serving as a seminar leader this summer with an educational

tour of Middle Eastern countries sponsored by The American Education Abroad Scholarship Fund.

University of Bridgeport. Joseph S. Roucek, Chairman, has been invited by the federal government of Germany (Bonn) to study the sociological developments in that Republic.

Brooklyn College. The Department suffered the loss of two members through retirement this year: Willoughby Waterman, who served more than thirty years in the City Colleges of New York, and LeRoy Bowman, who has served in the Department for twelve years.

Three members of the Department will return from sabbatical leaves in the fall. Samuel Koenig has been at Bar-Ilan University in Tel-Aviv, Israel; Felix Gross has spent the year as a Fulbright lecturer at l'Università degli Studi di Roma; and Joseph Jablow has made a study of land tenure among the Ponca Indians for the Department of Justice.

Alfred McClung Lee will return from a special leave in September. He has served during the year as UNESCO Professor of Sociology at l'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy.

Leo Chall, founder and editor of *Sociological Abstracts*, has recently received a grant of 5,000 dollars from the National Science Foundation for the publication of the *Abstracts*.

Marion Cuthbert has been granted a sabbatical leave for 1958-59.

The American Anthropological Association has designated Robert W. Ehrich as an official delegate to the Fifth International Congress of the Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences, meeting at Hamburg, Germany, August 24-30.

John Madge, former General Secretary of the British Sociological Society and currently Principal Scientific Officer for the British Building Research Station of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, is serving as Visiting Professor for the academic year.

Seymour M. Miller, recently promoted to Associate Professor, is currently on sabbatical leave and is conducting research on psychiatric consulting service to schools and low-cost psychiatric clinics under the auspices of the Rockland County Mental Health Association.

George Simpson has been promoted to Associate Professor and was granted a sabbatical leave for 1958-59. He has been awarded a senior Fulbright lectureship in Sociology at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands.

Hugh Smythe, who has been promoted to Assistant Professor, has rejoined the Department after a research leave under a grant from the Ford Foundation to study the elite in Nigeria.

University of California, Los Angeles. Donald R. Cressey has become Chairman of the Department, succeeding Leonard Broom, who, having completed five years as Chairman and three years as Editor of the *American Sociological Review*, is on sabbatical leave in Australia to conduct research under Guggenheim and Carnegie Corporation grants.

Joining the staff in the fall of 1957 were Wendell Bell, Northwestern University, appointed Associate

Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Richard J. Hill, Bell Telephone Laboratories, appointed Assistant Professor of Sociology; Oscar Grusky, University of Michigan, appointed Instructor in Sociology. Mary Jean Huntington, Columbia University, and Yuzuru John Takeshita, University of Michigan, have accepted appointments as Instructors in the fall of 1958. On visiting or part-time appointments in the 1958 spring semester are Robert H. Talbert, Texas Christian University; Edward C. McDonagh, University of Southern California; Benjamin B. Tregoe, System Development Corporation; Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, UCLA School of Nursing.

Carleton College. E. Franklin Frazier was Visiting Professor on the Hill Family Foundation Lectureship during the second semester, 1957-58. R. L. Langworthy and D. M. Okada were acting co-chairmen during the second semester. Jean Newirth has been appointed Instructor.

University of Chicago. A program in Comparative Education has been established to stimulate research and provide advanced study in comparative education for graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. The Ford Foundation has made a grant to assist in development of the Center and the support of a five-year program of studies and fellowships. The program is under the direction of C. Arnold Anderson, with the assistance of Francis S. Chase, Robert J. Havighurst, Herman G. Richey, and other members of the Department of Education, together with faculty members from the Departments of Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Sociology, and other departments of the University, who have specialized knowledge of the countries under study.

Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel. The current American address for Rafael E. Gill is Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

North Carolina State College. C. Horace Hamilton, head of the Department of Rural Sociology, was named 1958 winner of the Oliver Max Gardner Award, presented by the Board of Trustees to the member of the faculties of the Consolidated University of North Carolina who "has made the greatest contribution to the welfare of the human race" during the current academic year. Hamilton was president of the Rural Sociological Society in 1949-50 and is currently president of the Southern Sociological Society.

Northern Illinois University. The following staff additions have been made for the current academic year: Harold E. Smith (Ph.D., Cornell), Associate Professor, formerly of Mt. Union College; James G. Martin (Ph.D., Indiana), Assistant Professor, formerly of Oklahoma University; Robert A. Lorenz (M.S., NIU), Instructor. Charles E. Howell has been named Director of Research.

The University of Oklahoma. Jack E. Dodson, formerly of Texas College of Arts and Industries, has joined the staff as Assistant Professor. Reed M. Powell has returned from a Smith-Mundt lecture appointment at the University of San Carlos, Guatemala, and is presently a post-doctoral student at Harvard University. Wyatt Marrs, departmental Chairman, has published the volume, *The Man on Your Back*.

University of Southern California. Robin M. Williams, Jr. is Visiting Professor during the Summer Session. Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr., of the University of Washington, became Assistant Professor of Sociology in September, 1957, and Dennis C. McElrath of Yale University will join the staff as Assistant Professor beginning September, 1958.

Stanford University. William M. McCord, formerly of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard University, has been appointed Assistant Dean of Humanities and Sciences and Assistant Professor of Sociology. He is the co-author with Joan McCord of *Psychopathy and Delinquency*.

Robert A. Ellis, formerly of the Department of Sociology at the University of Southern California, has been appointed Assistant Professor of Sociology. He has received a grant from The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health to compile a bibliography relating to social stratification and personality development. Ellis is a participant in the Behavioral Science Research Conference this summer at the University of Mexico under the sponsorship of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research.

Mrs. Jan Howard has been made an Instructor in Sociology.

Paul Wallin has been appointed visiting scientist at the National Institute of Mental Health.

Wayne State University. The Department awarded its first Ph.D. to William Faunce, now at Michigan State University.

Harold L. Sheppard, on leave of absence as a Fulbright Scholar in France, lectured at the Seminar in Sociology, Instituto Statistica, University of Rome; Edgar A. Schuler continues on leave of absence as a Fulbright Scholar in Bangkok, Thailand; and Frank Hartung is on sabbatical leave.

Mel Ravitz has been appointed chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Relocation, Detroit Housing Commission. He will direct the 1958 Wayne State Summer Workshop in Human Relations.

Louis Ferman is studying job dislocation and radical ideology under a grant from the Wayne State University of Michigan Institute of Industrial Relations.

Donald C. Marsh continues as acting Chairman. He is a member of the Council of the Detroit International Institute, in which Leonard W. Moss is a sociological consultant.

BOOK REVIEWS

Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power. By KARL A. WITTFOGEL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957. xix, 556 pp. \$7.50.

A good hundred years ago Karl Marx introduced into his system the concept of "Asiatic society" as a special form of societal organization, based upon a low level of "civilization" and large-scale irrigation works, occurring in the desert areas between the Sahara and the high plateaus of Asia (*New York Daily Tribune*, June 25, 1853). Marx never attempted to study the factual basis of his theory; it remained crude and imprecise and seems to have served mainly as an excuse to explain why he did not include non-Western countries in his basic theory. The theory gained importance in Lenin's day when Communism began to spread into Russian Central Asia and later when there were hopes that China would become Communistic (1927): if these countries were structurally different from Western countries, a different program of action would have to be developed to convert them; moreover, there was raised the possibility of a different final product.

Wittfogel entered this discussion some thirty-five years ago and attempted from then on to refine Marx's thoughts and to develop them into a real theory. His work came to a provisional climax in 1938 with the publication of a "Theory of Oriental Society." In the present book he devotes a whole chapter to the changes in the theory made by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and shows how the changes were not the result of deeper insight or the collection of better data, but of changes in the political line. It is, however, unfortunate that the author puts into the same category with these politicians such scholars as G. Childe who have brought to light new information and accordingly have changed their theories for reasons other than a mere change in the party line. Wittfogel's history of the theory would also have been more valuable had he reported on the discussions among scholars in China, Japan and India, and the occurrence of the theory at the present time within the Soviet orbit. It does not seem to be dead there (p. 411), as evidenced by J. Prušek (*Archiv Orientalni*, 22, Prag 1954, p. 1-2) who includes in his characterization of Chinese

society the same traits which Wittfogel mentions as typical traits of "Oriental Despotism": large-scale irrigation works and extensive road construction necessitating centralized government and a bureaucracy whose members due to their power accumulate wealth and thus become landlords.

The present form of the theory as presented by Wittfogel exhibits a number of differences from the 1938 form, although a special study would be needed to gain full clarity because the author discusses only in footnotes and not always clearly his present attitude towards earlier opinions. The main point seems to be that he is now against using the term "feudal" for any period of Chinese society because he now accepts the narrow definition of feudalism instead of the former wide, Marxian definition. He has dropped his concept of a special "Oriental feudalism" and speaks only once of "quasi-feudalism" in the loosely dependent periphery of Oriental despotic states (p. 310). On the other hand, he still upholds the theory of a "cycle of crises" in Oriental societies (p. 171 n)—a concept parallel to the Marxist crisis theory in Western societies—but he does not give any detailed discussion of this important feature (only brief general remarks on retrogression, as on p. 417, seem to refer to this theory). While in the 1938 theory the natural factors (rain versus irrigation agriculture) were regarded as of fundamental importance—because they supposedly induce definite modes of production which in turn produce specific forms of society, thus making possible a classification of societies and of their stages of development—the 1957 theory centers around the concept of "agromanageerial despotism" which is regarded as an essential and also as the only specific trait of Oriental society (p. 414). The other "essential but not specific traits are: large-scale government-managed irrigation works, corvée labor, and serfdom. These essential traits occur also in other societies, but Wittfogel states that in an Oriental society they become specific through their dimension and/or their special configuration.

Oriental society can be "tribal" (p. 142), primary or secondary (p. 414), compact or loose (p. 166), marginal (p. 173) and sub-marginal (p. 195). It is one of a minimum of five societal "conformations" (p. 419); it sur-

passes all other stratified pre-industrial societies in duration, extent, and the number of persons dominated (p. 418). It is in character stationary (p. 445). Among the Oriental societies are: Hawaii, the Suk in East Africa, the Chagga in Africa, the Zuni in New Mexico, the Roman Empire, Byzantium (although their hydraulic activity consisted mainly in bringing drinking water into towns), the Arab empire, Moorish Spain, Iran, ancient Peru and Mexico (these two are, therefore, even now "imperfect democracies"—p. 432), India, and Russia during and after the Mongols. Oriental despotism spread "into the woodlands of Germany" and only later did Western Europe return to a non-hydraulic form of society (p. 212). But Japan, Holland, Belgium and Northern Italy, which all have been using extensive irrigation systems, are not hydraulic societies, although once the Etruscans supposedly created in Northern Italy a "sub-marginal" hydraulic society (p. 197). Hydraulic society spreads by diffusion into areas which do not have irrigation. The use of the concept of diffusion in this manner is rather surprising. On the other hand, in spite of strong Chinese culture influence upon Japan, and in spite of the existence of irrigation in Japan, the decisive "trends were unable to shape Japan" (p. 198).

At this point, several remarks may be made: (1) What is the usefulness for modern research of a theoretical model which is so crude that it encompasses dozens of societies which differ from one another in thousands of important traits and which are regarded as stationary in character over thousands of years? (2) If "agromanageerial despotism" is introduced as one of the essential and the only specific trait of Oriental society, large-scale government-managed irrigation works cannot be called another independent essential feature: it is already contained in the first term (cf. p. 8) which consists of three, in reality non-specific, elements. (3) The term "despotism" is not clearly defined. What, for example, is the difference between "occidental despotism" (p. 299) and absolutism? This point, as does the previous one, refers to the loose use of terminology, which has been criticized by other reviewers. (4) There are "early," non-state-centered hydraulic societies (p. 416) which, therefore, did not have large-scale government-managed irrigation works, and yet are called Oriental societies. How can we determine when a society still can be called an Oriental society in spite of the absence of one or more essential traits? How can we determine whether the dimensions of essential traits in a society having only essential traits but not the specific trait are such that the former become specific?

Objectionable from the methodological point of view is Wittfogel's failure to distinguish between institutional and functional data, as well as his incomplete evaluation of their interaction in time and space. For example, Wittfogel describes how in despotic societies almost all details of the daily lives of subjects are regulated by the government. As proof, he mentions either some law or some actual occurrence. In the first case, he specifies neither the period when this law was in force, nor the geographic or societal sector in which it applies, nor the degree to which it was enforced. If he would examine all U.S. legal codes, he would find that they contain innumerable laws concerning many intimate aspects of our private lives; on the basis of these laws, our society could be called "despotic." But the existence of a statute does not mean that it is enforced. Few nations ever had the Roman concept of law. In the second case, he takes his example from one definite historical period, without checking whether the example really indicates a general usage or not, or whether the usage was limited to a specific moment in time or was typical for a long period.

Because the basic concepts are too unclear, they are too inclusive. For example, anyone who has lived in irrigated areas knows that there are many different forms of irrigation: by well, by tank, by terraced fields, by canals above the level of the fields and canals below the field level; irrigation by bringing water, by draining water away, by a combination of both, etc. All these may occur as individual enterprise, and/or on a family, clan, tribe, community, or state basis. Can such different forms all result in the same type of society? Are the Egyptian pharaoh, the Russian Tzar, and the Chinese emperor really the same type of despot? Are the Chinese mandarins, recruited from a number of upper-class families in spite of an open examination system (p. 351), the same "managerial bureaucrats" as the slave-officials who served some Near Eastern despots?

The perhaps most crucial test of the theory is whether it does justice to the data. Unfortunately, the book suffers from a lack of that which Wittfogel claims Toynbee has too much (p. 371), namely "attention to detail." For instance, it is incorrect to call the Chinese emperor a "despot." There are as yet no monographs which have studied the position of the Chinese emperor over the last 2000 years, but it is known already that the emperor's role underwent various changes: for example, he was not always regarded as the only man responsible for the conduct of government;

he was, in some periods, manipulated by factions of powerful families; in many periods he was bound to follow laws and ethical principles which he had not made and could not change; there are other periods in which the emperor seems to have been an absolute ruler. It is not true that imperial China "tolerated the predominance of privately owned land over a long period of time" (p. 303). Japanese scholars have outlined the development of private landownership in China over the centuries in all detail. The government has not "in this case . . . restricted the owner's proprietary position by . . . directives as to what crops should be grown" (p. 303): such interference was typical of some periods only, and not always of those when the power of the emperor was strongest. The government also did not restrict the landowners' position by "a fragmenting law of inheritance" (p. 303). This law of equal inheritance of sons was an old customary law in China and in many other cultures. Primogeniture is typical of only very few societies and over historically short periods. Equal inheritance does not lead to much fragmentation if the average mortality is high and life expectancy low, as can be proved by the study of genealogies and land registers. It is not true that despotic power was total (p. 101) in Oriental societies such as China or India: there were organizations which in certain periods of history were nuclei of power and which the "despot" had to take into consideration—for instance the secret societies, the Buddhist church, and federations of landowning gentry families in China, or the castes in India. Artisans were organized in China and India. In China, they became free in exactly those centuries in which "despotism" was supposedly strongest. It makes no sense to speak of the absence of privately owned land in the Islamic Near East without discussing the whole Islamic concept of property and the concept of religious conquest; the situation is much more complex than in other countries. It is not true that the Chinese were interested only in *corvée* while the Japanese were interested in revenue (p. 199): Sung China replaced *corvée* by taxation. Almost all data adduced by the author could be discussed in a similar way and as a result, in my opinion, different generalizations would have to be made.

As Wittfogel's theory stands today, it may perhaps be used by somebody as a political weapon (p. 10), but I can hardly believe that it will be used as a tool in sociological analysis.

W. EBERHARD

University of California, Berkeley

Science and the Creative Spirit: Essays on Humanistic Aspects of Science. Edited by HARCOURT BROWN. For the American Council of Learned Societies. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958. xxvii, 165 pp. \$4.50.

Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization. By JOHN U. NEE. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1958. xiv, 163 pp. \$4.00.

Here are two small and interesting books that have similar virtues and similar defects for sociologists. The virtues consist in their suggestive approaches to large historico-sociological problems and in their use of comparative literary, historical, artistic, and "humanistic" materials generally. The defects stem from the lack of systematic sociological theory and from the neglect of important sociological works in the broad areas of intellectual concern these books cover.

Science and the Creative Spirit is the product of a Committee on the Humanistic Aspects of Science brought together in 1950 by the American Council of Learned Societies. Though they met to discuss sporadically for four years, the Committee could not agree on a common statement. Instead, four of the members wrote essays covering different facets of the humanistic aspects of science and employing different kinds of humanistic materials. These four essays, introduced in a short piece by the editor, Harcourt Brown, are: "Scientific and Humanistic Knowledge in the Growth of Civilization," by Karl Deutsch (political scientist), "Those Scattered Rays Convergent": Science and Imagination in English Literature," by F. E. L. Priestly (professor of English), "Tensions and Anxieties: Science and the Literary Culture of France," by Harcourt Brown (professor of French literature), and "The Creativity of Science," by David Hawkins (professor of philosophy). Each of these authors has striven mightily, with more and less success, to define science, the humanities, and the nature of the relations between the two. Although the definitions are not entirely clear nor consistent, the several essayists seem to be agreed that science and the humanities have similar characteristics as well as differences, that the relations between the two are reciprocal, and that the reciprocal effects are both beneficial and harmful. Since it is the expressed purpose of the Committee "rather to open up an area for research and discussion than to set forth a final and considered opinion," the Committee's efforts can be considered to have preliminary success. It is to be hoped, however, that future efforts by this or similar committees will pay more atten-

tion to establish theory and research in the sociology of science.

Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization is the published version of Professor John U. Nef's Wiles Lectures given at the University of Belfast in May, 1956. Although Professor Nef began his distinguished career as an economic historian, he has, in recent times, had more general intellectual interests that have been expressed in the Committee on Social Thought of the University of Chicago, which he helped to found some fifteen years ago and of which he is now the chairman. As a younger man, twenty-five years ago, he published his two-volume work, *The Rise of the British Coal Industry*. In this study, almost immediately recognized as a classic of economic history, Professor Nef discovered some of the early origins of the Western world's industrial revolution in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He showed that large-scale, capitalistic enterprise, based on large markets and pushing for continuous technical innovation, was certainly present in the British coal industry at this time. But further, his studies led him "to suggest very tentatively that the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries may have been marked by an industrial revolution only less important than that which began towards the end of the eighteenth century" (Vol. I, p. 165). The new perspective on the rise of the modern world provided by this suggestion has been a fruitful stimulus to later historical and sociological research.

In the last twenty years, having become dissatisfied with narrowly economic and technological explanations of the rise of modern industrial civilization, Professor Nef has been studying its cultural sources, that is, the scientific, artistic, religious, moral, and philosophical ideas and ideals that interacted with economic and technological changes to produce modern Western society. With the principle of this broadened intellectual concern most sociologists would now heartily agree. Do we now not recognize that modern society is different in all of its parts from the society it succeeded? Do we now not, therefore, accept as a fundamental premise that we shall eventually explain the emergence of modern society only by studying changes not merely in economic structure and technology, nor merely in the several parts of the cultural realm, but in all of these and in the political, kinship, social class, educational, and communications structures as well? Do we not now, finally, see that the changes in the several parts were interrelated with one another, with no one part always changing first, the others not always following such changes? The explanatory sociologi-

cal model these premises imply is surely no easy one to apply to historical data. But nothing else will do in the long run, and we must strive, in the short run, to approximate the model in all investigations of the rise of modern industrial society.

Professor Nef is, then, attempting to move historians and others toward a more adequate explanatory model for this task, the explanation of the rise of modern industrial society. Unfortunately, the cultural variables he brings into his explanation alongside of economic and technological variables are not clearly defined. We need a more precise specification of what "the human spirit," of which he often speaks, is. What, to take a few other examples of his terms, are the "economy of delight," "the mind itself," "increased tenderness among men," or "the discovery of woman"? We need still more evidence than he has given us for these suggestive notions to see what they are and how they are useful. Nor, again unfortunately, does Professor Nef always make it clear how his cultural variables are related either to one another or to social structural variables such as economic or political relationships. One final fault. Because of his sympathy for Catholic humanism, when he is discussing the religious origins of modern society, Professor Nef tends to treat only the changes in Catholic ideas and monastic organization. He does not ever mention Weber and the theory of the Protestant Ethic, not even to oppose it. While we can be glad that Professor Nef has reminded us that changes in Catholicism also contributed to the rise of the modern world, we cannot accept his neglect of Protestantism nor of how changes in the two major branches of Christianity were related to one another.

The world of scholarship in general and of sociology in particular cannot be made up entirely of precise theories and conclusive evidence. Those who lust for such a world commit themselves to frustration. In the world of social science as it is and probably must be, *Science and the Creative Spirit* and *Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization* offer substantial, if lesser, virtues for which we can be grateful.

BERNARD BARBER

Barnard College, Columbia University

War and Society in the Seventeenth Century.

By SIR GEORGE CLARK. Cambridge: The University Press, 1958. vii, 152 pp. \$3.75.

Professor Clark is a sociological historian. His special field is seventeenth century Western Europe, a period in which that area enjoyed no more than twelve years of freedom

from internal war. The subject of this book then seems almost a natural one. For Professor Clark, "European civilization in the seventeenth century was a military civilization."

In the current historical sweepstakes the seventeenth century is a much admired entry, and many of its backers would take issue with our author as to whether or not its character was essentially military. Professor Clark, however, bases his case quite firmly on his working assumptions, both historical and sociological. He finds that during the period under study the nation state was the dominant social entity, and that the conduct of war was the chief form in which it made itself felt, both internally and externally.

The book itself consists of six essays. The first two compare warfare and duelling, analysing the differences in social attitudes towards violence serving, on the one hand personal and, on the other, collective ends. The next two treat warfare first as an expression of conflict within European society, and then as an element in the creation of a greater sense of community. Finally there are two case studies: "The Barbary Corsairs," an examination of a society devoted almost exclusively to war, and the "The Cycle of War and Peace," an excursion into metahistory.

If Professor Clark's objectives are sociological, his approach is nevertheless a political one. What has been variously described as Machiavellianism or *raison d'état* is accepted as the basis of social values for the period under study. War was justified because it served the ends of the state. Duelling fell into disrepute "because as an institution it could not be reconciled with the high purposes of organized society."

Central to such an argument is the assumption that social ends determine social usage. Thus, for example, Clark finds that "the [seventeenth century] military revolution altered the military ways of the governing classes." But it did more than that. It radically transformed the governing classes. Wherever the new methods of warfare penetrated, military command shifted from those who in their own right shared in the sovereignty to those who were in every way servants of the state.

The state was not necessarily the instrument of this change. It can be debated whether the Barbary Corsairs, that most warlike of societies, was in any real sense a nation. The analogy of a joint stock company seems equally apt. As Professor Clark demonstrates, piracy represented a career and its practitioners were as likely to be Christian or renegade as Moslem. The possibilities of organized violence as a profession here ran prior to and, to a con-

siderable extent, determined what were subsequently seen to be the needs of the state. In Prussia, the most thoroughgoing example of the social consequences of the military revolution, it was difficult to decide whether the state served the army or vice versa. The newly centralized states of the seventeenth century were as much exploited by as exploiters of the public professions.

What it comes down to is that Professor Clark's is not the only kind of sociological history. For him, history is a methodological instrument of sociology; the study of what collective bodies managed to do sheds light on their internal structure. There is another school represented by Marc Bloch and Lewis Namier which reverses the relationship, and which seeks through the description and analysis of the activities of individuals to illuminate the setting in which they operated. Seventeenth century civilization is, for Professor Clark, a military civilization because, for him, the man of that century was a political animal. But since even policemen have private lives, this, it should be pointed out, is not the whole story.

M. D. FELD

Harvard University

The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900. By RICHARD D. ALTICK. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957. ix, 430 pp. \$6.00.

Based on a wide variety of both primary and secondary sources, this historical study, compiled by a professor of English literature, holds considerable interest for the specialist in the sociology of knowledge. It is at once a descriptive chronicle of the formation of the first mass audience in European society and a rudimentary analysis of the forces responsible for the emergence of that body.

As a descriptive account, its principal merit is its exhaustiveness. In tracing the expansion of the reading public of nineteenth-century England from a relatively small aggregate composed of members of the upper and upper middle strata to a multitude that included the majority of every social class, it presents a wealth of data on such significant aspects of the subject as the growth of literacy, the development of the popular press, the establishment of public libraries, and the improvement of elementary and secondary education. In addition, it carefully examines a diversity of minor aspects: the influence of railway travel on reading habits, the preference of respectable publishers for small editions, the contents of the penny shockers and the sensational weeklies,

the beginnings of the second-hand book trade, the cheap-book movements, the literary diet of the self-educated, and a host of others. By virtue of this diligence and comprehensiveness, the study provides much of the background necessary for an understanding of mass culture in contemporary England. It should be read in conjunction with Richard Hoggart's brilliant examination of twentieth-century English working-class life, *The Uses of Literacy*, in which the story is brought down to the present day.

Considered as analysis, the study is penetrating and perceptive. Identifying Evangelicalism and Utilitarianism as the dominant ideological creeds, it demonstrates their essentially middle-class character, their effectiveness in safeguarding and promoting the interests of the aristocratic-mercantile alliance that wielded political power, and their influence upon what was written and what was published. Most important of all, it lays bare their curiously ambivalent attitude toward reading. Both creeds favored the extension of literacy; both also greatly feared it. Evangelicalism favored it as indispensable to the true religious life but was apprehensive that it would be misused by the unregenerate for the enjoyment of imaginative literature, which pious people regarded as a snare of the devil. Utilitarianism favored the spread of reading as essential to the advancement of the individual, the progress of society, and the improvement of mankind but feared that it would be utilized for the pursuit of amusement rather than for the acquisition of knowledge. As a consequence of this ambivalence, while both creeds prompted many efforts to enlarge the literate public, they likewise inspired all sorts of attempts to dictate its reading preferences and to control the literature to which it had access. The promoters of the movement to establish Mechanics' Institutes, for example, sought to bring scientific knowledge to the ordinary workingman, but they did not wish him to study political theory. Similarly, the sponsors of the movement to found free public libraries welcomed the lower-class reader; but they were unwilling to supply him with works of fiction. In probing the roots of these conflicts, the study provides a great many valuable insights into such classic sociological problems as the social and cultural determination of ideology, the functional role of ideas, and the orientation of the writer toward his special audience. It is an instructive book.

J. JEAN HECHT

New York City

Philadelphia Gentlemen: The Making of a National Upper Class. By E. DIGBY BALTZELL. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958. 440 pp. \$5.75.

Professor Baltzell's book, like all good books, raises more questions than it answers. Yet one may be permitted to ask how many of the author's unanswered questions have the merit of novelty and penetration, and whether answers have not already been supplied—or at least proposed—by others.

On the level of description this work has many virtues. In effect it is a history of the Philadelphia "aristocracy," written with the full benefit of the tools of sociology. Sociologists may prefer to view it as an intensive analysis of an "upper class," greatly enriched by historical imagination and documentation. Fortunately, this is rapidly becoming a distinction without a difference. Professor Baltzell's work demonstrates how much the two disciplines need one another and the fruitfulness of their marriage. His demonstration, moreover, is marked by unusual sophistication and simplicity.

Baltzell is not in the least bemused by what may be called the shock of revelation. He makes his readers thoroughly aware at the outset that even democracies must have "minority leadership," that a "classless society" is a "sociological monstrosity." "A less utopian, more empirical test of democracy," he writes, "is whether the inevitable 'minority of leaders,' or oligarchy, is both *accountable* to the rest of the population and drawn from *all social levels* and not solely from the ranks of a few privileged families." Even though he stresses ease of upward mobility as socially desirable, moreover, Baltzell evades the common trap of using this criterion in an absolute way. "In modern America," he writes, "virtue and social mobility have become synonymous. Our vices are often perverted virtues, however, and too much social mobility, especially at the elite level, perhaps may weaken the traditional means of checking the power of leaders."

A key distinction in Baltzell's work is that between the "elite" and the "upper class," that is, to put it with too little qualification, between leaders by virtue of occupation and accomplishment, and leaders by virtue of birth and heredity (or "ascription"). The interplay between these overlapping segments of the "aristocracy" supplies the dynamic element in Baltzell's "historical analysis of the structure and function of upper-class institutions." His method of identifying these segments is both elegant and effective. His "elite" is made up of those Philadelphians who appeared in *Who's Who in America* in 1940; his "upper class" is made up of those

in the Philadelphia *Social Register* for the same year. Of the 770 Philadelphians in *Who's Who in America*, 226, or twenty-nine per cent, were also in the *Social Register*. These 226 persons, high-born and occupationally highly placed, form the core of Baltzell's study. Essentially they made up what he calls "an American business aristocracy, of colonial stock and Protestant affiliations." He examines their family backgrounds as far back in American history as the data permit, and their changing "neighborhood" relationships, religious affiliations, educational practices, and club memberships. He also analyzes their public role and that of their families in politics, journalism, the professions, letters, art, and philanthropy. All this is done with a meaningfulness rare in such descriptive work, and with unusual psychological penetration.

Throughout his book Baltzell keeps up a running commentary on the limitations of the work of the "Warner school" for generalizing about American "class structure" and especially about the nature and role of the "upper class." He finds that few of the Warner school's conclusions from the study of a small and ossified community such as "Yankee City" are relevant to life in an old yet vigorous "metropolis" like Philadelphia. No doubt Baltzell's criticisms of the Yankee City "team," and their needlessly elaborate methods, are sound. Here is one place, indeed, where the job was already well done before Baltzell, though there is no reason why he should not profit from it. On the other hand, one of the two principal failures of Baltzell's own work is his inability to bring off his analysis of metropolitan Philadelphia as a study of "an American metropolitan upper class" (reviewer's emphasis). As has been shown most forcibly by C. Wright Mills, a distinction must be made between a "metropolitan" upper class and the American or "national" upper class. Baltzell uses the term "National Upper Class" in his subtitle. He also refers more or less frequently in his book to certain institutions and habits shared by the Philadelphia upper class with the upper classes of Boston and New York and the eastern seaboard generally. No doubt this area is the cradle of the national upper class; but an intensive study of Philadelphia leaders, such as Baltzell's, only indirectly illuminates their relationship with national power. Moreover, this illumination is not offered by the author except in the most flickering way.

The second fault I find intensifies the first. Very near the end of his book, Baltzell writes: "In analyzing the growth of an upper-class way of life in metropolitan America, and especially in describing the social patina of Proper Philadelphia, there is a danger that we lose sight of

the main function of an upper class: the perpetuation of its power in the world of affairs, whether in the bank, the factory, or in the halls of the legislature." This danger Baltzell himself has not evaded. His book tells much more about upper-class Philadelphia's way of life than about the way the upper-class exercises its power even in Philadelphia. The relationship between this "metropolitan" power and national power is scarcely mentioned, except by the identification of certain men in the seats of power in both areas. It remains a question, moreover, whether the local seats of power, even "in banks, factories, and legislatures," are indeed the real seats of national power. The fact that Baltzell's work is about Philadelphia rather than New York or Washington only heightens the need for demonstration of its national relevance.

Though this book does not achieve the scope intended by its author, it remains a valuable work. Men of power in our great cities may not necessarily be men of national power. But the cities themselves are of immense importance; our knowledge of them and of the direction of life in them will be greatly enhanced when we have studies of other metropolitan upper classes as good as this one of Philadelphia.

WILLIAM MILLER

Ridgefield, Connecticut

The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group. Edited by MARSHALL SKLARE. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958. xi, 669 pp. \$10.00.

Comprehensive studies of American Jews appear in clusters after long intervals. It has been sixteen years since *Jews in a Gentile World* (edited by Graeber and Britt) and *The American Jew* (edited by Janowsky) were simultaneously published. Now, in the wake of volumes of similar scope recently edited by Friedman and Gordis, and Kohn, as well as one written by Glazer, comes the book that is likely to be most useful to sociologists. Marshall Sklare's *The Jews* is more than a "reader;" it is a splendidly edited collation of thirty-three selections representative of the best social science research and theory on American Jews. Unlike its predecessors of 1942, the Sklare book is not a symposium of contributions from commissioned authors. Nor is it based largely on reprints. The editor has culled judiciously and painstakingly sources ranging from the more competent, unpublished doctoral dissertations at Yale and Chicago to classic publications such as Warner and Srole's Yankee City study. Over half of the pieces are published here for the first time. The six sections of the book deal with the

historical setting of American Jews, their demography and social mobility, the Jewish community, religion, psychological aspects (belongingness and identification), and cultural aspects and value orientations.

Although the book is consistently high in calibre, mention should be made of particularly outstanding selections: Glazer on the middle-class status of Jews, Gans on Jewish suburbanization, Greenblum and Sklare on small-town Jewry, Rosen on adolescent Jewish religiosity, Carlin and Mendlovitz on rabbinic roles, Yarrow on Jewish personality development, Adelson on minority group authoritarianism, Mandelbaum on change and continuity in Jewish life, Myers and Roberts on mental illness, and Snyder on Jewish sobriety. The editor was especially sensitive to the need for bringing together findings from communities of various sizes and regions.

Research during the past decade and a half reveals, among other things, that in comparison with non-Jews the rate of Jewish social mobility has been higher, the birth rate and family size are smaller, and there is a smaller proportion in the labor force but a greater proportionate representation in professional and managerial occupations. Despite the suburbanization which they have experienced along with other Americans, the character of Jewish population is still preponderantly urban. The Jewish community is now second-third generation and inclined to be child-oriented. Orthodoxy's strength varies directly with community size. Studies also show that the Jewish religion and ethnicity are not perfectly articulated. There is a widespread secularization of religious observances, and the rabbi now finds himself responding to a loss of authority. Membership in the Jewish minority complicates the process of socialization, and personality constriction is found to be correlated with the extremes of Jewish identification. The effects of Jewish culture and its value orientations are to be seen in low rates of juvenile delinquency and alcoholism, widespread acceptance of psychoanalytic psychiatry, and liberal voting behavior. And Jews, more than other ethnics in American society, are concerned with the maintenance and perpetuation of the traditional subculture and organized life of the group.

Conspicuously absent from the book, in contrast to the lengthy consideration they received earlier by Graeber and Britt and Janowsky are analyses of anti-semitism and assimilation. The fact is that publication of research findings and new ideas on such basic questions have been relatively rare in recent years. Another important gap, acknowledged by the editor, is in the sociology of the Jewish family. For un-

known reasons, even though fictional literature on the American Jewish family abounds, social scientists have largely avoided research in this vital aspect of Jewish life.

There is an unavoidable redundancy of discussion of some aspects of Jewish social stratification. An index would have added considerably to the book's usefulness and there are too many typographical errors. On the whole, however, the editor and his contributors deserve accolades for what is likely to be the authoritative sociological analysis of American Jews during the next decade.

MILTON L. BARRON

The City College of New York

Alcohol and the Jews: A Cultural Study of Drinking and Sobriety. By CHARLES R. SNYDER. Monographs of the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies, No. 1. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958. 226 pp. \$5.00.

Demonstrating once again that a study of a practical problem often leads to the most significant advances in scientific theory, this brilliant research advances knowledge of human behavior as a sociocultural phenomenon rather than a function of individual personality traits or of physiological "cravings." The general research question with which Snyder, along with others at the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies, starts is "what causes drunkenness, and its pathological form, alcoholism?" The popular and long-accepted answer is "drinking intoxicating beverages." But this is not scientifically satisfactory, for some people drink frequently and practically never get drunk or become alcoholics. The Jews are chosen for study because they are a cultural group of which this is largely true. In scientific terms, they are a "negative case" through which theoretical knowledge can be advanced.

The data came (1) from interviews with a "random" sample of 73 New Haven Jewish men, and (2) from questionnaires administered to a sample of 644 male Jewish college students. The sample is biased in favor of Jews who are identified as Jews; particularly in the case of the students there was an effort to get those who go to colleges where there are a significant proportion of Jews. The author used this procedure to build up the number of Orthodox for comparative purposes, but it creates a bias which he does not fully consider.

Following Bales, and rejecting other theories after examining the evidence for and against them, Snyder builds a well-supported case to

show that Jews traditionally drink for religious and communicative reasons and not for secular or hedonistic reasons. Drinking which is early associated in the Jewish child's mind with religious symbolism can never be later used for escapism or mere good fellowship. Of course, as is painstakingly demonstrated, those Jews who are partially or completely removed from religious orthodoxy are more likely to drink as non-Jews do and to become tight or drunk. This thesis is tested in all its ramifications. Even where there are differences in sobriety and intoxication within particular categories of Jews according to regional origin, generation, and class, Snyder shows that these are due to the degree of attachment to orthodox traditions and not to the influence of region, generation, and class themselves. Even the ingroup-outgroup situation in which Jews find themselves is related to their religious orthodoxy as far as its effect on their drinking patterns is concerned: "For the Jew to become intoxicated symbolized the futility of the Jewish moral struggle in a society which holds Jewishness in disesteem" (p. 181). Thus, while Jews drink frequently, the drinking nearly always carries an aura of religious symbolism, and they do not drink to get drunk.

Snyder has developed a beautiful demonstration of his thesis. But, in my judgment, it is not the whole picture, and I shall suggest only one other part of it to show that there are other parts. Snyder notes, for example, that even secularized Jews are practically never alcoholics. He attempts to explain this by saying that traditions linger on even though their religious basis has been sloughed off (p. 194). But his thesis attributes the moderate drinking of Jews to ritualistic *behavior*, and it will not do to ignore the fact that a probable majority of American Jews are completely or largely secularized. (Evidence: a recent sample census reports that only 3.9 million Americans admit they are Jews and a good number of these are non-practising, whereas Jewish organizations estimate a minimum of 5.5 million Jews, using refined estimating techniques. It is possible that Snyder's biased sample misleads him here to believe that Jews are more religious than they actually are.) Further, a significant proportion of Jews—both those of the Reform tradition of Germany and of the Socialist tradition of Eastern Europe (neglected by Snyder)—have non-orthodox *traditions* dating back several generations. Without denying in the least that the Jewish *religion* creates barriers to drunkenness, one can also observe that the segregated

status of Jews as a minority group also creates barriers to drunkenness and that this affects non-religious and religious Jews alike.

One must start with the question, "Exactly what *behavior* leads to drunkenness?" Snyder develops the motive for this behavior—hedonism—but does not clearly specify the behavior itself—drinking a large quantity of alcoholic beverage *at one time*. The next research question must be: "Where and when do people—Jews or non-Jews—drink a large amount at one time?" The answer—which Snyder almost completely neglects—is that most people drink large amounts in a tavern or bar. Now some Jews think taverns and bars are evil—the religious influence—but the more important fact is that most Jews are *afraid* to go into a tavern (and many into a bar). The frequenters of the lower class tavern, especially, form a quasi-primary group, from which minority groups are excluded. The religious tradition would keep Jews who live in predominantly Jewish neighborhoods from developing their own taverns (upper class Jews occasionally support ghetto-ized bars), but the large proportion of Jews who do not live in such neighborhoods do not go into neighborhood taverns or bars simply because they feel, and probably are in fact, excluded. So they drink only within the family or at friends' homes, and hence do not drink enough to get drunk. The few Jews who are accepted by non-Jews in primary relations in a tavern—in military and student settings—do in fact get drunk. This is not solely because they are secularized, but it is also because they are *accepted* by non-Jewish companions (Snyder erroneously deals with this solely as "pressures" from non-Jewish companions).

A parallel could be found in the case of the highly disorganized lower class urban Negro community: lower class Negro men have the highest rates of social pathology in almost all respects but one—they do not become bums. That is, they do not frequent hoboemia, simply because the white bums will not tolerate their company. Negro ne-er-do-wells stay at home.

One of the dangers of good theory-building and systematic theory-confirming is that it tends to lead to mono-causal explanations when many causes are actually at work. This study thus provides a splendid example of both the good and bad aspects of research based on systematic theory.

ARNOLD M. ROSE

University of Minnesota

American Freedom and Catholic Power. By PAUL BLANSHARD. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. xii, 402 pp. \$3.95.

Democracy and Catholicism in America. By CURRIN SHIELDS. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958. ix, 310 pp. \$5.00.

For the sociological student of religion, a key question is: How does a society, by its economic, political, and other structures, influence the religious life of its members? Furthermore, the student wants to know: How does religion affect social structures and processes? The questions become more complicated when one asks: How is a religious system with roots in many societies affected by their various patterns, and does it affect them differently? Clearly such a religious system becomes differentiated (one cannot equate Spanish, French, and American Catholicism). But does its multi-societal position reduce the tendency toward differentiation? Is its supposed unity only a superficial joining of a series of separate religious movements? More adequately, to what degree and under what conditions do these various possibilities prevail?

Implicit in these problems are important questions for the sociology of bureaucracy, for the analysis of social change, for the exploration of the conditions under which societies show a "strain toward consistency," and for other sociological questions.

Neither of the books under review frames its problems in these terms; yet each offers an hypothesis concerning the relationship of Catholicism to society. Blanshard, in this revised edition of his widely discussed book, says, in effect: An "alien" church maintains its alien quality and imposes it on the new society as far as it is able. The Catholic Church in the United States, because of its efficient organization and tight discipline, is able to wield a great deal of influence despite its minority status. Much of this influence is contrary to basic American values as Blanshard sees them.

Shields indicates that the Catholic Church, found in a wide variety of societies, expresses itself differently in each yet maintains a fundamental Thomian unity. It does not challenge democracy, in his judgment, because the Church has no political view intrinsic to it; nor on the other hand is it fundamentally changed by democracy. Liberalism as he defines it (an eighteenth century concept, with strong emphasis on the elitist tendencies of a Locke

or a Madison), is antithetical to both democracy and Catholicism. But the latter two have no basic contradictions.

Many of those who oppose Blanshard's rather shrill blast will applaud Shields' interpretation; yet his interesting essay in political theory does not really come to grips with the question of the day-by-day activity of the Catholic Church in the United States. Perhaps three-fourths of Shields' book is given over to careful definitions and interpretations of what he means by Democracy, Liberalism, and Catholicism as "pure types." His clear definitions make it possible to describe neat patterns of relationships. Unhappily the facts are not as neat as his models. To distill the essence of Catholicism from encyclicals and famous Catholic writings makes for clarity of definition, but often obscures the full range of the facts.

Shields' book is not well described by its title. In fact, there is relatively little in it about "Democracy and Catholicism in America." It is in no sense a rebuttal of Blanshard, although the dust jacket would lead us to believe it was. In only one chapter, an interpretation of "Christian Democracy," do explicit Catholic programs receive extended treatment—and most of the material in the chapter refers to Europe, not to the United States. His essay is valuable primarily as an analysis of the relationships among Democracy, Liberalism, and Catholicism conceived as theoretical systems. I found this very interesting, but it has little to do with Blanshard's concern with the way contemporary Catholic leaders in America affect the public school system or impose "distinctly Catholic taboos" on the mass media.

For all their differences, these books have one remarkable similarity—the tendency to define their terms, Catholicism especially, on the basis of official claims and pronouncements. The selection is different and the tone is different, but the obfuscation of vision is the same. This leads Shields to imply that Augustine's doctrine of "Two Cities" is an accurate guide to Catholic behavior concerning the relationship of ecclesiastical and civil rule. The facts are as various as the present situations in the United States and Spain. The sociological problem is to discover the conditions that lead to the various types of relationship. Blanshard has a similar tendency to define Catholicism in terms of official statements; but to him, this means not simply doctrinal unity but a monolithic power structure, bent on domination. His chapter on "The Catholic Plan for the World" has something of the

tone of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion." If he could persuade himself to draw together some of the observations in his own book into a chapter that might be entitled "*Catholic Freedom and American Power*," he would focus attention more clearly on the extent to which individual Catholics behave in terms of their occupational, class, regional, educational, and other social positions, and not simply in terms of their Catholic identity. He would also highlight the extent to which the requirements and values of American society limit and shape Catholicism.

There is a great deal in each of these books, but they cannot be taken as adequate guides to the general question of the relationship between religion and society, specifically between Catholicism and American society. If anyone needs facts concerning the way the Catholic Church supports science for the educated and sponsors the use of relics and miracles for the uneducated, Blanshard can furnish them. He has gathered evidence of sharp Catholic attacks on the "heresies" of others, accompanied by extreme sensitivity (to the point of using censorship where possible) to any attack on Catholic beliefs. Certainly there is evidence in his book that in some matters the hierarchy of the Church is not content simply to persuade Catholics to follow their judgment, but seeks as well to control the community and the national scene, for example, with respect to their values concerning birth control and movie censorship. (This is not surprising, granted their values; it is clearly more effective to prevent a movie from being shown at all than to rely on instructions to church members.)

Few persons challenge the accuracy of Blanshard's facts; but they are highly selected facts. His weakness is the weakness of the illustrative method, because he has no adequate theory of the relationship between religion and society. He describes a rather horrendous picture of America under Catholic "cultural and moral control," and then asks whether the picture is fanciful. "One answer comes from Ireland. . . . Another answer comes from the Catholic nations of our own hemisphere." These are no answers at all, for the settings are so different in other ways.

These books are items along the way toward a sociology of Catholicism in the United States. The student of religion will want to read them, but read them with care.

J. MILTON YINGER

University of Michigan

American Protestantism and Social Issues 1919-1939. By ROBERT MOATS MILLER. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958. xiv, 385 pp. \$6.00.

Authors who set out to condone or to condemn, or who limit their study to the determination of an institution's role in the production of a particular set of consequences, or who take a specific hypothesis to examine—all these have a more sharply defined task than those who seek to describe multivarious attitudes and acts of institutions and of individuals over a relatively long period of time. It is this latter task to which Mr. Miller has addressed himself, and the book he has produced, resting on wide-ranging and painstaking research, lacks in many respects the excitement of a book with a strong argument, or of a book with a specific set of hypotheses.

What can be said of American Protestantism in the inter-war years is necessarily equivocal: churches and ministers expressed opinions at all points of the compass, and actions often belied the expression of fine sentiments. All, no doubt, were professionally committed to the condemnation of sin, but the testimony of what constituted sin remained obscure, and the extent to which its remedy involved public action as well as private guidance, remained equally a matter of divergent opinion. But in general such theological issues lie outside Mr. Miller's concern. His procedure is to trace denominational opinion on specific issues, as expressed in the resolutions of councils and conferences, in the attitudes of the denominational press, and in the pronouncements of distinguished clergymen. In consequence, the church as a lobby is better shown than the church's impact on the social attitudes of its own followers; ministerial opinion is presented almost to the exclusion of that of the laity. Occasionally the real tensions between ministerial and lay opinion are thrown into relief when Mr. Miller reports the congregational ejection of its minister, but these cases of conflict within denominations are not pursued, nor is their social basis examined, although the range of opinion among ministers and editors is faithfully described.

Perhaps it would not be possible to indicate the real strength of church attitudes, and their consequences for action, although the disparity between theory and practice is sometimes illustrated—in cases of race relations, labor policy and pacifism, for example. The impression one draws is that the clergyman on the spot often succumbed to less principled views of the prevailing situation than those expressed in the formulations of Christian virtue

promulgated by national committees and editors remote from the scene of the particular lynching, strike, or violent police action.

The differences revealed between denominations are certainly informative, although one must remember the limited information about the attitudes of the laity, whose denominational differences might well have been less pronounced. The curious alliance of fundamentalism, gross intolerance, reaction, and aggressive self-righteousness comes out clearly on a host of issues. It is equally noteworthy that usually academics among ministers display the most liberal attitudes. Trends are also well brought out: the optimistic pacifism of the 20s, and the desperate pacifism of the 30s, the leftwards drift of intellectuals within the ministry, the growing internationalism, and the mounting sympathy with labor. At one point the author appears to show some sympathy with the opinion that since the church had helped labor, labor ought to support the church (pp. 286-7). This view posits a curious reciprocity, side-stepping the demand that genuine conviction be the basis of belief, and perhaps leading to a dilution of the mission of both union and church. In general, however, Mr. Miller confines himself to a purely descriptive presentation: the book should be most valuable to social historians who seek a clear and concise account of ministerial attitudes on social issues in the inter-war years.

BRYAN R. WILSON

University of Leeds, England

Katholieke Minderheid en Protestantse Dominant. By W. GODDIJN. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957. xx, 289 pp., including a 5-page English summary. Fl. 13.

Every culture has its sacred areas, off limits to serious social inquiry: a Kinsey report would be inconceivable in Holland, and in the United States we prohibit even basic census enumeration by religion. American social scientists interested in the sociology of religion can learn a lot from a study of Holland, where the religious cleavage goes through the entire society and affects behavior patterns in every setting. In addition to the secular *Mens en Maatschappij*, there are two excellent sociology journals issued under the auspices of religious institutes, the Protestant *Sociologisch Bulletin*, and the multilingual Catholic *Social Compass*. The editor of the latter, Professor G. H. L. Zeegers, is also director of the Catholic Social-Ecclesiastical Institute, which sponsored the publication of Goddijn's book, the third in a series of monographs on social questions as seen from a Catholic point of view.

The major subject of "Catholic Minority and Protestant Dominant" is the life of Catholics in a province of Friesland, where they constitute only about seven per cent of the population. To a remarkable degree, this small group has retained its independent existence and prevented an integration into the Protestant majority. In the oldest Catholic communities, which go back to before the Reformation, the cohesive sentiments of the 17th century have been passed on from one generation to the next; and many of the more recent Catholic immigrants also zealously maintain their subculture inviolate in the middle of a Protestant environment. As Goddijn points out, the small number of Protestants in the predominantly Catholic southern provinces have tended, on the contrary, to move away from their religion. Under varying circumstances, that is to say, a very small minority may tend either to disappear into the dominant group or to achieve a heightened self-consciousness and thus an independent life of almost indefinite duration. The contrast is interesting, but Goddijn's explanation of it in terms of "autochthony" and "allochthony" is hardly adequate.

This detailed survey of Catholics in Friesland is introduced by several chapters on the theory of minority-majority relations. These are based largely on the writings of American sociologists, both such general theorists as Louis Wirth and Arnold Rose and in particular such more recent writers as J. J. Kane and Will Herberg, who have adapted the earlier analyses of ethnic groups to one of interreligious relations. This is an extension, however, to a different type of minority. The classical minority in American sociology, the Negro, defies discrimination as being treated differently from the majority. He wants only to disappear into white society, to lose his ghettos, his Negro occupations, and every other specific group characteristic—including, if this were possible, his color. European minorities, on the contrary, have typically fought to maintain their independent existence, often against the policy of the majority culture to absorb them completely. The theory that has been developed in analysis of Negro-white relations cannot be appropriately used without considerable revision in a discussion of the Catholic group even in the United States, and the transfer of these concepts overseas is even more hazardous.

According to the last census, Catholics constituted 38.5 per cent of the Dutch population, and in an arithmetical sense thus they were a minority. In what sense, however, is the residual population, the non-Catholic "dominant," a unit? "The characteristic feature of the minority-dominant relation," according to

Goddijn, is "the exclusion, subordination, or discrimination by the dominant." Is the whole of the non-Catholic population united in its general opposition to Catholicism, or is this even the impression that they give to Catholics? Actually neither is the case, as we can learn for example, from Goddijn's own interviews. According to one respondent, "Most of the Netherlands Reformed are not anti-Catholic, although this is the case among most of the *Gereformeerden*" (the smaller, more orthodox Calvinist sects); this contrast is repeated by almost all of the other persons quoted.

The Catholics are the largest coherent group in Dutch politics and social life—a plurality rather than a minority. From the 1880s to the present day, there has hardly been a Dutch government in which representatives of the Catholic party were not included, and this political power is only the most significant of the Dutch Catholics' full emancipation from all one-time political and social discrimination. Even in such a province as Friesland, where they form a small minority, Catholics derive many benefits from the substantial national power of their coreligionists in the rest of Holland.

If individual Catholics retain the feeling of being a persecuted minority, thus, this is ordinarily based not on their own experience but on a knowledge of past history. In the 19th century, the Catholics' resentment of being second-class citizens was the psychological foundation of the new political party, and if this indignation can be retained now that the Catholics have achieved their "emancipation," Catholic organizational life can have the best of both worlds. Both the many histories of Dutch Catholicism and the beginning series of studies on small Catholic minorities in, for example, Friesland or Sweden (in a recent issue of *Social Compass*) have this effect, and one wonders whether this may not also be their principal purpose.

WILLIAM PETERSEN

University of Colorado

Review of Sociology: Analysis of a Decade.

Edited by JOSEPH B. GITTLER. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957. ix, 588 pp. \$10.50.

The process of fragmentation that has afflicted knowledge for several centuries has now reached the stage of splitting the disciplines which originally broke free from philosophy. The present volume reveals clearly how far this process has gone in sociology. It becomes increasingly apparent that sociology is a single discipline only in the sense that its practi-

tioners share some sense of identification and that it does concern itself with social life. To one who took his graduate work just before the decade described (1945-1955), the bibliographies attached to each chapter show only too clearly the impossibility of "keeping up with the literature of the field" and destroy any illusion that one has done so. Unfortunately, sociology also seems to have passed the point where volumes of this sort can in any real sense bring one up to date.

Despite the sub-title this work does not constitute an analysis of a decade. Where analysis is seriously attempted, it is at the expense of a review of the literature; where there is an effort at the review of literature there is little analysis and extremely spotty description. This is not the fault of the authors but of the limits of space. It is simply no longer possible to discuss seriously a major sub-field of sociology in twenty-five to forty pages. For example, the opening essay on sociological theory, written by the editor, is twenty pages in length. The last seven pages are devoted to an account of "Systematic Substantive Theory in Sociology." Parsons has a page and a quarter in which it is possible to name the pattern variables but not to include a single word of definition; Merton and Znaniecki each have half a page. Levy has three-quarters of a page stressing his contributions to functional theory which has been discussed earlier. To one who has read these writers there is nothing wrong with what is written here; but it must go without saying that to one who has not read widely in this area almost nothing is conveyed or can be conveyed except that in the author's judgment the theorists mentioned were the important contributors to the work of the decade.

Another case in point is the second chapter of the book on "Quantitative Methods" written by Samuel A. Stouffer. Here the author struggles bravely within the limits of twenty-four pages to convey the importance and meaning of such topics as game theory, sequential analysis, stochastic processes, information theory, cybernetics, and experimental design. The materials in some of these cases are brilliantly summarized, but for the most part the chapter cannot be regarded as a successful introduction to the description and analysis of the topics. It does serve to indicate the important literature and the major areas of development.

Where the author has not taken too seriously the injunction to review the literature of the decade, analysis becomes possible. Thus Bert Kaplan in his chapter on "Personality and Social Structure" presents a very interesting analysis and critique of the literature on the securing

of conformity to the demands of social structure. This is made possible, as the author himself indicates, by sharply limiting the range of topics covered in the chapter.

Where a theoretical frame of reference of great sharpness has been created and further development has not occurred, it becomes possible for an author to give a thumb-nail description of many pieces of empirical research and to locate these pieces in their appropriate niches in the theoretical framework. This is what Herbert Blumer does with respect to "Collective Behavior" in a chapter of almost classic clarity.

The other ten chapters of the book could be classified into one or another of the three categories indicated. Clyde Kiser's "Population Research," Noel P. Gist's "The Urban Community," Howard W. Beers', "The Rural Community," W. Lloyd Warner's "The Study of Social Stratification," F. Stuart Chapin's "Social Institutions and Voluntary Associations," William Foot Whyte's and Frank B. Miller's "Industrial Sociology," Robert F. Winch's "Marriage and the Family," Robert F. Bales', A. Paul Hare's, and Edgar F. Borgatta's "Structure and Dynamics of Small Groups: A Review of Four Variables," Robin M. Williams' "Racial and Cultural Relations," and Marshall B. Clinard's "The Sociology of Delinquency and Crime,"—all these are well-written and interesting essays. But they cannot and do not serve as introductions for the novice or adequate reviews for those once familiar with the fields. Rather they are for the most part either catalogues of the literature without real analysis, or statements of personal theoretical viewpoints in the fields discussed, or analyses of a limited range of topics, or classifications of the empirical research in the field. With the exception of the first type, most of these essays more appropriately belong in a volume wholly devoted to the field they discuss, and make of the volume in which they do appear a collection of miscellaneous sociological pieces.

All of this is to say that a genuine stock-taking or an effort to bring into the compass of one work a sustained and detailed review of each of the major fields demands a format similar to that of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, not that of the commercial text. In the meantime we ought not kid ourselves that a course built around such a work as the present one constitutes an introduction to the fields of sociology, or that a reading of such a work on our own part gives us a general working knowledge of the discipline once more. A thoroughgoing reading of the hundreds of items in the bibliographies attached to each chapter and in the bibliographical sup-

plements on "The Sociology of Education," "The Sociology of Politics," "Culture Change," "The Sociology of Religion," and "The Sociology of Art" might do it; but that after all is just what we have not had the time to do.

WILLIAM L. KOLB

Tulane University

Social Perspectives on Behavior: A Reader in Social Science for Social Work and Related Professions. Edited by HERMAN D. STEIN and RICHARD A. CLOWARD, with a Foreword by GORDON HAMILTON. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958. xix, 666 pp. \$7.50.

This is a book of primarily sociological readings edited by two social work educators. It is organized around a number of concepts essential to practitioners—family structure and socialization, ethnic group, social role, social value, social stratification, bureaucratic structure, and deviant behavior. The reader can be useful to persons teaching the kind of preprofessional social work course that aims to bring to the field of social welfare some of what sociology majors can reasonably be expected to have learned in prior sociology courses.

Sociologists—who teach as undergraduate majors probably more than half of the students who now enter graduate schools for social work—have reason to be concerned over the fact that this sociological reader will perhaps have its greatest use in professional schools at the graduate level. Why do social work students and other clinicians require such an exposure to basic sociological concepts? Are we failing to make a lasting intellectual impact on a significant proportion of our majors? Or why else do they lose sight, after a brief exposure to Freud, of how the ideas of Durkheim, Weber, Merton, Mead, Hollingshead, Parsons, etc., are relevant to professional education?

Like all readers, this one tells a great deal about the development of the field of knowledge it is designed to serve. Few of the articles deal specifically with social work situations, although there are some noteworthy exceptions, such as Albert J. Cohen's "School and Settlement House," Kingsley Davis' often reprinted "Mental Hygiene and the Class Structure," Floyd Hunter's "Community Power Structure in Social Welfare," and "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole" by Lloyd E. Ohlin, Herman Piven, and Donnel M. Pappendorf. This is no reader on the sociology of social welfare, itself a growing area of inquiry.

It has a foreword by Gordon Hamilton, one

of social work's distinguished psychiatrically-oriented casework professors. She asserts that "the social worker of tomorrow can no longer restrict himself to consideration of how the client feels about his situation—he must be equally attuned to the effects on the client of ethnic, class and other significant group determinants of behavior." It is a view no longer radical in social work education. This reader will serve its implementation.

JOSEPH W. EATON

University of California, Los Angeles

Industrial Sociology: The Social Relations of Industry and the Community. By EUGENE V. SCHNEIDER. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957. ix, 559 pp. \$6.75.

This book aims "to systematize a large body of existing research in the field of industrial sociology and other disciplines within one framework. . . ." It consists of a brief treatment of "Social Theory and Productive Systems" (including chapters on the rise of modern industry in America and Europe) and more detailed analyses of the social structure of industry and unions, and of the relations of industry, community, and society. As a textbook, it compares favorably with others available for upperclass courses in industrial sociology; as systematic analysis it is less successful.

Any attempt to "cover" the jumbled literature of industrial sociology is bound to founder without some guiding perspective. The structural-functionalism upon which Schneider draws, if used with more consistency and precision and if applied to a more clearly delineated field, might have served well. Schneider is concerned with the impact of industrialism on social life, but such terms as "industrialism," "industry," "industrial institutions," "factory system," "industrial management," and "industrialized" are used interchangeably and without definition. The framework, the author says, "is designed to provide a dynamic analysis of social systems." It consists mainly of vaguely defined concepts of role, role strain, personality, social structure, and culture. Motivation is handled in the manner of Thomas' four wishes. The four "generalized goals"—instrumental, recognition, security, and response—are in application translated into more numerous and specific "community goals" (for example pp. 179ff.). In general the book handles structure better than change, role and role strain better than the interplay of economic and non-economic institutions. The treatment of personality is casual.

The best parts of the book stand quite apart

from the scheme. Sufficient detail, accuracy, and clarity make especially useful the discussions of industrial bureaucracy and the roles of executive, staff experts, office workers, and foremen, and the functions of the informal group. Drawing upon Barnard and others, Schneider never loses sight of the conditions to which the workplace must adapt: technology, type of personnel, and a changing social environment. Nor does he forget that the executive role, shaped by the context of bureaucracy and technology and the necessity for profit, is at once demanding and diffuse, constraining and yet open to personality impact. There are competent and insightful treatments of union history, structure, and function and the relation of industry to the community, minority groups, and government—none of which rests on what the author terms his "role-personality" scheme.

Factory life may not resemble the playful, relaxed routine sometimes heralded in the sociology of prosperity, but neither does it fit a picture of "empty" formal relations "barren of opportunities for the development and expression of personality" (p. 161). While Schneider is well aware of variations in technology and work, his concern with the psychology of role strain occasionally leads him to stereotyped writing about "the" worker's role and an emphasis on fatigue, frustration, and impoverished social relations.

The same limitation appears when Schneider comes to the labor movement and tries to incorporate Perlman, the Webbs, and Tannenbaum into his "role-personality" framework. Much of the impatience traditional students of labor display when confronted with up-to-date sociology is rooted in the resistance of more established disciplines to encroachments on their job territories, the anti-intellectualism of the applied scientist, and the historian's contempt for our ignorance of the past. But one can sympathize with their impatience when the notion that it is to management's advantage to keep the costs of labor low is translated, ". . . there is a constant downward pressure on the remuneration attached to the worker's role as a structurally generalized goal" (p. 343). On page after page the old list of worker motives and union goals (power, income, security, etc.) is unfolded with an added sociological filip. Far from achieving more generality than does Perlman's "job scarcity consciousness," Schneider's theory finally falls back on "historical circumstances" (p. 348) to account for vast variation in labor movements. One difficulty besetting both Perlman and Schneider is that across time and country the worker's

role strains are relatively constant, the labor response variable; the former cannot explain the latter. Why revolutionary syndicalism in one place, business unionism in another, efficiency socialism in a third? Surely a "theory of the labor movement" must confront such questions.

The book ends with a discussion of social change and possible increases in the power of labor, technicians, and management. One wonders what concept of power permits the simultaneous final predictions that (1) the present power of management "will in all likelihood be maintained;" (2) "the power of labor will . . . continue to grow slowly;" and (3) ". . . the power of government over both management and labor will continue to increase. . . ." (p. 498)

The author could have up-dated some of his statistical data and made more use of primary sources. In its better parts, however, the book represents a conscientious coverage of the literature, and, for the alert student, graduate or undergraduate, it provides a stimulating introduction to the field.

HAROLD L. WILENSKY

University of Michigan

Industrial Society and Social Welfare: The Impact of Industrialization on the Supply and Organization of Social Welfare Services in the United States. By HAROLD L. WILENSKY and CHARLES N. LEBEAUX. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958. 401 pp. \$5.00.

The proliferation of services, organizations, and personnel in the field of social welfare is partly the result of the profound changes that have taken place in the American social structure over the past half a century. Although there is a large body of literature written largely by and for practitioners which deals with various aspects of these new social-welfare institutions, they have received little systematic sociological treatment. *Industrial Society and Social Welfare* by Wilensky, a sociologist, and Lebeaux, a social worker with sociological training, examines social welfare services within the context of the changes wrought by industrialization and urbanization; it constitutes a pioneer effort in a relatively uncharted sociological field.

The book is organized around the theme that "the technological changes of industrialism lead to changes in the structure of society; these societal changes, in the context of American culture, produce or intensify concern about certain social problems, which creates a demand for welfare services; the supply takes the form of social agencies, public and private, manned

by professional social workers and other welfare specialists" (p. 181).

Part I begins with a delineation of the salient features of capitalism as these developed within the framework of American culture, and then proceeds to an extensive discussion of the quite different "early" and "later" effects of industrialization on the social structure. The early effects—the shift of population from the country to the cities, instability of job tenure, entry of women into the labor force, etc.—resulted in the emergence of a large and depressed working class. However, the secondary effects—increased specialization, the development of new occupations and skills, the growth of large scale, bureaucratized economic units, etc.—led to a general upgrading of skill and income of the population and to a corresponding expansion of the middle classes within the stratification system. This part of the book concludes with a suggestive but too hurried discussion of some of the implications of industrialization, urbanization, and suburbanization for the integration of the individual into various primary groups—the family, neighborhood, voluntary associations, and friendship groups.

The first two chapters of Part II survey some of the current conceptions of social welfare, and the scope of existing welfare programs. The two concluding chapters represent an interesting departure from the traditional format of social welfare and social problem texts. Instead of superficially discussing a wide range of social problems and mechanisms that have been evolved to deal with them, the authors have wisely chosen to sacrifice coverage in favor of a rather intensive, illustrative analysis of two fields—family problems and juvenile delinquency. Each of these problem areas is analyzed in relation to the changes in the social structure that were presented in Part I. One finds here, for example, a suggestive discussion of how the emergence of the new middle class and the diffusion of the middle-class style of life has led to changes in the nature of problems presented to family service agencies, and to shifts in clientele, and how these, in turn, have produced problems for agencies and changes in their policies and practices. Here, too, the authors provide several illustrations of the important function that family service agencies perform in helping individuals to cope with socially generated strains for which adjustive mechanisms have not yet become institutionalized.

Finally, Part III discusses at some length the major organizational forms involved in the supply of social services—the social agency and

the profession of social work. The concept of bureaucracy as formulated by Weber and modified by more recent empirical studies constitutes the framework for a systematic analysis of the organization and operation of social agencies, and for suggesting hypotheses to guide further research in this area. The book concludes with a thoughtful and provocative analysis of social work as a profession, using as a theoretical framework the writings of Hughes, Merton, and Goode. The elements of similarity between the structure of social work and that of other professions as well as the differentiating elements are given attention here.

This book demonstrates that the collaboration of sociologists and social workers can result in a profitable exchange. On the one hand, use of theoretically relevant sociological concepts and research findings makes possible systematic analysis of social welfare organization and practices, and helps, particularly, in locating and formulating problems that require further research. The long run effect of such research, unquestionably, would be to improve professional practice. On the other hand, the social worker's knowledge of and experience with both the problems of clients and the problems of organizing welfare services can make important contributions to the sociological study of social problems, formal organizations, and the structure of professions.

ZENA SMITH BLAU

Chicago

Effecting Change in Large Organizations. By ELI GINZBERG and EWING W. REILLEY. Assisted by DOUGLAS W. BRAY and JOHN L. HERMA. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. xvi, 155 pp. \$3.50.

Without explicitly stating the problem of change that is their focus of attention, the authors discuss only that kind of change having to do with decentralization of authority. A straightforward description is made of the "problems" of such organization change, accompanied by minor case illustrations. The book is apparently intended primarily as a rapid reading source for operating executives faced with problems of decentralization and needing a practical guide to their solution.

The elements of change described are grouped under these headings: timing of change (in which organization change is viewed as a process, not an event), organization history (establishing the limits within which organization tradition determines kind and amount of change), rational appraisal (of the need for

change and the methods to be employed), control of anxiety (of principal executives and administrative bureaucracy whose anxiety is the product of changes in their organization functions), and techniques for controlling personal anxiety and reorienting administrators to their new tasks (through effective communications, control of work behavior, technological and organizational behavior retraining).

For sociologists, the most interesting feature of the book is the attention given to structural imperatives that make managers themselves resistant to decentralization. Repeatedly it is emphasized that from the principal executive officer down through the ranks of the administrative bureaucracy, those who hold power and exercise authority are reluctant to give them up. At the personal level, the anxiety engendered by delegation of authority and power is a product of perceiving this as a loss of status. At the organizational level anxiety develops because functions habitually performed are shifted to other positions, and those remaining are often changed in content. Functionaries' self-images of esteem as well as their actual operating behavior both undergo change when the organization decentralizes.

In an historical perspective this book highlights a major problem of rational, bureaucratic administration: the adjustment of operations to environmental demands. Such adjustments demand regular decision-making about the destiny of the organization. As organizations grow larger, the decision-making specialists function at increasingly remote distances from actual operations. The reasonableness of their decisions then becomes suspect because of the possibility that detailed knowledge of operations enters less and less into calculation of decisions. Hence the specialization of decision-making in bureaucratic administration, which has rational origins, may lead to non-rational functioning of the decision-makers.

The low level of functioning rationality among specialized decision-makers is the historical dilemma of large-scale organizations. Practical men of affairs are very much concerned with this problem. The principal answer to the problem has been to try to reverse centralization through decentralization of decision-making by shoving responsibility for decisions down to lower echelons of bureaucrats. This organizational solution has found support in social values which proclaim the virtues of democracy, even in administration. A social movement called Group Dynamics has had an important influence on managers in sustaining their belief in administrative democracy achieved through decision-making decentraliza-

tion. It is a fascinating side issue in the sociology of knowledge to consider the fact that a very practical problem of daily life finds a rationale for its solution in an ideologically committed social movement whose origin and leadership is not particularly sympathetic to the men of affairs caught up among its adherents.

Perhaps the whole issue of organization decentralization of decision-making needs a great deal more imaginative study than has yet been devoted to it. The book under review clearly identifies the problem, and provides the perceptive researcher with suggestive leads for tackling it.

ROBERT DUBIN

University of Oregon

Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. By NEAL GROSS, WARD S. MASON, and ALEXANDER W. MC-EACHERN. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958. xiv, 379 pp. \$8.75.

This book fulfills the promise of its title. In effect, it is three related monographs unified by a single-minded theoretical and empirical focus. With theoretical and methodological sophistication it treats a sector of a school system as a social system and in doing so lends intellectual dignity to the sociology of education and makes a contribution to the parent discipline.

The study deals with the roles of school superintendents and school board members in Massachusetts, and treats: (1) consensus on role definitions among and between 105 superintendents and 508 school board members, (2) consensus among and between role incumbents in 105 small social systems, (3) school board members' conformity to a set of twelve professional expectations on which there was strong agreement among superintendents, and (4) intra- and inter-role conflict involving superintendents and school board members. In addition, the authors develop a theory of role conflict resolution.

In the early chapters there are careful analyses of the central concept, of its uses and misuses, and of the often untested or unexplored assumption of uniform role perception. (Of 150 items bearing on expectations of superintendents' and school board members' roles, there was marked disagreement on 63 per cent of them!) This conceptual examination leads to a "language for role analysis."

The data came from lengthy interviews of a 50 per cent probability sample of superintendents and school board members, and includes statements on expected performance, on division of labor, on the expected or "proper" attributes of role incumbents, and on friendships and participations of the superintendents.

In the analysis of expectations and consensus among all incumbents of these roles two measures were used: the variance of the distribution of responses among five options provided an inverted measure of consensus; and chi-square and t tests were used to test inter-position consensus. For analyzing consensus between superintendents and their school board members within a given system the investigators used variance of responses among members of the given school board, and the dispersion of school board members' scores around the superintendent's score.

The study is methodologically self-conscious. Procedures, problems, and compromises are meticulously reported. The reader may disagree, as I did, with certain of their decisions, but the important point is that this is possible. Perhaps most important, the data seem to be remarkably good. The authors did not apply million dollar tools to ten cent data.

Some fifty hypotheses are tested. These are usually stated so as to have general significance, and are then stepped down to bear directly on the test situation. Here are three examples, all of which were supported by the evidence.

The more directly expectations bear on the relationships between incumbents of two positions, the less agreement there will be between them.

Among incumbents of a given position, or among their superordinates, there will be greater consensus on prerequisite expectations (for attributes necessary for carrying out the task) than on post-requisite expectations for behaviors by means of which the task is carried out.

The larger the school board, the less the consensus among school board members and the more the consensus between school board members and the superintendent.

In the final chapters the authors first investigate cross pressures to which a superintendent is subjected. Then a theory of role conflict resolution is developed from the cross classification of two incompatible expectations, two aspects of role expectations (legitimacy and sanctions), and three orientations to expectations (the moral, the expedient and the moral-expedient). For these various permutations, predictions are made to four types of role-conflict-resolution behavior: conformity to one or the other of the two incompatible expectations, compromise, and avoidance. Among 291 role-conflict situations reported by superintendents, the theory led to correct prediction in 91 per cent of the cases.

There follows one of the finest sections of the book in which the authors raise two questions: Is the theory complete? Is it cumbersome? In a model analysis of deviant cases and a critical scrutiny of their own theoretical handiwork,

they conclude that the answers are "no" and "yes," respectively. The clean development of the argument, the testing, and the retrospective criticism constitute a rare and gratifying example of insight and craftsmanship.

EVERETT K. WILSON

University of Michigan

The Highfields Story: An Experimental Treatment Project for Youthful Offenders. By LLOYD W. MCCORKLE, ALBERT ELIAS and F. LOVELL BIXBY. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958. x, 182 pp. \$2.60.

The Highfields Story is a welcome addition to the scant literature regarding the differential effectiveness of varying procedures in the treatment of delinquency. All too frequently, favorable appraisals of "progressive," therapeutic procedures represent statements of optimistic faith oblivious to the demands of empirical testing and experimental control.

The authors have gathered and presented a good deal of data supporting the view that a permissive and therapeutic environment results in a rate of community adjustments superior to the adjustment rates of a control group who were exposed to conventional reformatory life. A secondary aim of the study was to determine what kinds of boys were most likely to be helped by the Highfields milieu. There was an attempt to determine whether or not factors such as color, age, and education bore any relation to the ability to utilize successfully the treatment program at Highfields.

Highfields has been able to maintain an informality of relationship with its youthful clientele; this is based on a self-conscious and official opposition to institutional bureaucratization, and a wise insistence that the number of boys treated be held to a minimum. The major treatment device, aside from the pervasive emotional climate, is to be found in the nightly group-therapy sessions to which all of the delinquents are exposed. The verbatim reports of these group-therapy sessions, presented in the study, are of great interest to all who are interested in the attitudes, rationalizations, and self-images of delinquents.

There may be adduced from the findings a message of deep significance. The Highfields Story represents an important antidote to the "hard-headed revisionism" that has arisen in the delinquency-panic of the last decade. There has been an element of solidity in the revisionist argument that has appealed to the disenchantments of the "soft-hearted" (the traditional enemy of the hard-headed). For this reason, this form of revisionism has made significant inroads

into the thinking of both academic observers and social work practitioners. The soft-hearted, suffering from his frequently cited "failure of nerve," has been all too ready to grant to the hard-headed a monopoly of realism and prudence, and to acquiesce in a general societal stereotype of the "soft-hearted-as-crackpot"—interesting and refreshing perhaps, but addicted to long-haired schemes of little practical consequence.

It is for these reasons that the findings of the Highfields Story, tentative as they may be, attain a significance beyond the admittedly limited scope of the study. They affirm what we should have known all along—that a warm, reasonably permissive, emotional climate coupled with a conscious and collective attempt to achieve insight into one's problems represents, at one and the same time, the most humane and the most hopeful of the available paths in the treatment of man's social and psychic ills. It would be heartening, and delightfully ironic, if it turned out that the hard-headed are the naive crackpots, and the soft-hearted the mature realists.

DAVID MATZA

Temple University

The Sutherland Papers. Edited by ALBERT COHEN, ALFRED LINDESMITH, and KARL SCHUESSLER. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956. vi, 330 pp. \$5.00, paper.

In a period of public concern with the problem of crime and delinquency, it is instructive to look at the work of an American criminologist of Edwin H. Sutherland's stature. The appearance of *The Sutherland Papers*, a collection of writings spanning a quarter of a century, affords a splendid opportunity. This volume contains a series of papers and addresses, some previously published and some from Professor Sutherland's files.

The editors, who knew Sutherland as teacher, academic colleague, and personal friend, have organized the material topically and introduced it to the reader with explanatory remarks preceding each section. These notes relate particular selections to phases in Sutherland's career and to the system of thought that he evolved over the years. Frequently they allude to Sutherland's beliefs and values and to some of his characteristics as a thinker and teacher.

The volume starts with a section on the differential association theory, perhaps the outstanding attempt on Sutherland's part to reformulate criminological theory. This is followed by a section on white-collar criminality, a field of major emphasis in the latter days of Sutherland's career.

land's academic career. Some views on juvenile delinquency and its prevention are contained in two papers on that topic, followed by sections on the control of crime, methods and techniques of the field, and evaluations of some research monographs.

Throughout these papers two outstanding characteristics impress themselves upon the reader. One is Sutherland's unshakable conviction of the value of the sociological approach to criminological research, arising out of his insight that crime is a "social fact" and, to use midcentury terminology, a "group phenomenon." The other is the scrupulous care for logic and scientific method, which includes an insistence on the need for theory and rigorous research and a healthy skepticism of panaceas or "obvious solutions." With these qualities, his work falls in the best tradition of scientific criminology, which alone has been able to furnish the insights that have hitherto accrued.

At the time many of the earlier papers were written, the pendulum was swinging rapidly from a sociological to a psychopathological approach. To this trend Sutherland presented a powerful counterforce, despite the heavy criticism that was sometimes directed at him. Today, when the value of a sociological approach once again emerges, one is struck by the prophetic nature of Sutherland's persistent warnings against an overemphasis on individualization of treatment and artificial isolation of the offender in etiological research.

Sutherland appears in these papers not merely as a constructive thinker but also as a severe critic of his own work and that of others. This is shown in his evaluation of efforts at crime control and prevention and measures of social policy such as the proposed sexual psychopath laws. And, while he never attempted to hide his liberalism and humanitarian leanings, he never rested his attack primarily on such ideological foundations but buttressed his criticism with the carefully weighed scientific evidence at his disposal.

The editors have done a very creditable job in the organization and presentation of these papers. The judicious inclusion of published material together with the unpublished material gives the reader a good idea of the main direction of Sutherland's work, save for the one area represented by the professional thief and Sutherland's interest in the social role of the criminal.

For those who are familiar with Sutherland's published writings, there is perhaps little of a startling new character in these papers; but they will find in the collection a number of cogent questions raised and a number of principles restated which will bear reexamination

in the formulation of contemporary research projects. Those unfamiliar with Sutherland's work will find this a good introduction to it.

GEORGE H. GROSSER

Queens College

Criminology and Crime Prevention. By LOIS LUNDELL HIGGINS and EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1958. xii, 471 pp. \$8.50.

This is not an adequate presentation of the accumulated knowledge and available data which should go into a book on criminology. The authors have very little insight into the meaning of the statistical information which they take from the Uniform Crime Reports. They handle police arrests as if they are the real indicators of volume of crime. The treatment of law in its relation to crime misses the real point and gets beclouded with certain religious concepts. The attempt to present the various explanations of criminal behavior is very primitive for this day and age. The headings are there, but there is no content. For example, there are several sentences under "psychiatric and psychoanalytic approach to the personality problem," but no coverage of the various contributions. The material on environmental and cultural factors as well as the interpretation of them are terribly thin.

Organized crime gets mixed up with professional crime. Imagine a real confidence man or even a circus grifter thinking of himself in the same category with the Anastasia brothers. Racketeering is not described accurately. The authors function somewhat better—though still not adequately—in their chapters on police, courts, probation, prisons, and parole. The presentation of material on juvenile delinquency is on a better level than the earlier material. The material on the criminality of women is presented best of all, relative to what data are available. There are some excellent studies of military violators but these are not given in the authors' coverage on "the military and criminology."

The authors state emphatically that their major task is to slant their book on criminology toward prevention. This aim is ventilated in their first chapter and we are led to expect a real accent on this aspect of criminology. As it turns out, the smallest chapter of the whole book, the last chapter, is devoted to prevention and then the authors have nothing to say, except to echo some conventional statements about prevention. There are no job-analysis descriptions of actual projects which have attempted to prevent delinquency. As penance,

both authors should look through all the publications of the New York City Youth Board and go on to New York City to see the projects in actual operation.

The silent partner to the authorship is the one who comes off best. He is the publisher. He has done an exceedingly fine job in his format.

WALTER C. RECKLESS

Ohio State University

The Criminal Area: A Study in Social Ecology.

By TERENCE MORRIS. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958. New York: Humanities Press. xiii, 202 pp. 25s.

The close connection between crime and the city is a dominant theme in modern criminology. Roving bands of brigands, the rural arsonist, the grifter of the country fair—these remain more or less at the periphery of interest and the greatest share of attention is directed to the slum-bred juvenile delinquent, the urban gangster, and the city con man. This emphasis on the relationship between urbanism and crime is probably not surprising in a society which has experienced such a rapid and recent shift from a rural to an urban way of life and yet still treasures its rural heritage. And if, at times, there seems to be a naive attachment to the idea that God made the country and the devil made the city, the emphasis on crime in an urban setting has produced some of our most illuminating studies of criminal behavior in the work of social ecologists such as Shaw, McKay, Burgess, and Park.

It is within this tradition that Terence Morris has written his book *The Criminal Area*. Unfortunately, the author does little to expand or refine what has already been said on the subject and I am afraid that our fund of knowledge remains pretty much in its original state. Mr. Morris begins by examining the concepts of ecology and the idea of a delinquency area; then, in what I think is the most original and most valuable portion of the book, he reviews some of the ecological studies of the nineteenth century done by Guerry, Rawson, Fletcher, and Mayhew. After presenting the work of the Chicago School and its criticisms—which may be of interest to the English reader but which the American sociologist will find rather routine—Mr. Morris devotes a chapter of thirteen pages to "Some Area Studies Since 1930." At this point, the author turns to a consideration of delinquency in Croydon (population in 1951: 249,870) with the intention of providing a cross-cultural testing of ecological propositions developed in the United States.

His tentative conclusions would seem to fit with the experience of those in the United States who have been faced with the problems of slum clearance and the construction of low-cost housing developments, but they appear to be largely a matter of underlining what is known: "... there must be a shift of interest from the natural area which has grown up of its own accord to the 'planned' area which has resulted from conscious social and political deliberation. In particular, emphasis must be laid upon the individual cultural unit, the family, which remains essentially unaltered as a social institution for the transmission of cultural values and as an agency of social control." I realize that there is a great need to document our supposed basic principles in sociology, but sometimes the process can be carried too far.

One other point of criticism, on a matter which is probably quite outside the author's control: the book contains an inordinate number of typographical errors and some of the area maps are quite indecipherable even with the aid of a strong magnifying glass.

GRESHAM M. SYKES

Princeton University

Cities in Flood: The Problems of Urban Growth.

By PETER SELF. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1957. 189 pp. 21s.

Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris.

By DAVID H. PINKNEY. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958. xi, 245 pp. \$6.00.

Although it should be read carefully by every American planner and administrator who is in any way concerned with metropolitan areas, *Cities in Flood* probably will go unread and its message unheeded for at least another decade. There is no evidence that there exists in the United States anything like the post-war awareness of the ills of conurbation which led the British leaders to action on the problem.

Self, who is a planner lecturer in public administration at the London School of Economics, argues well that "'congestion' and 'sprawl' are the besetting evils of conurban life." Adequate factual information justifying the need for comprehensive planning is presented (forty per cent of the population of Britain in seven conurbations, one-sixth of the Scottish population jammed into three square miles of central Glasgow, forty per cent of England and Wales declining or at best static, etc.). He supplements these telling figures with descriptions of the measures taken since World War II to combat congestion and sprawl, namely, the development of satellites close to

the large cities, the new towns built upon new sites, and the expanded towns. Branding the satellites as "modified failures" and pointing to the absence of virgin sites for brand new towns, Self sees the planned dispersal from conurbia as necessarily involving the expansion of smaller places, some of them tiny hamlets and some fair sized towns. Because the new and expanded towns which have been built to date are real towns within which people work as well as live, there is virtually no desire to return to the metropolitan congestion. The new towns average approximately fourteen dwellings per acre. The problems involved in the new town program are dealt with fully, including the complaints of the occupants (need for more play space, meeting houses, and movies), the tendency of the higher-paid worker to "beat a nightly retreat to some 'select' rural neighborhood," and the "frosty stares" which the program met in the wealthier areas of Surrey, Buckinghamshire, etc..

Still holding to the hope that the dispersal program will succeed, Self concedes that post-war idealism is being replaced by "... a mode compounded of utilitarianism, opportunism and expediency." He dates the slow-down from 1949 and attributes it to the "reemergence of a more *laissez faire* political climate," a leniency shown toward the desires of some private developers lest they risk "... withering the rebudding flower of private initiative," and a failure to solve the problems associated with "compensation" (payment for property taken by planning), and "betterment" (collection for increases in private land values resulting from the planning efforts). Arguing persuasively that the "decongestion of cities, the creation of greenbelts, the establishment of new towns" must be taken as parts of a single plan design, the author further insists that the plans must be regional in scope, must be under a single national ministry which will not take away entirely the play from local authorities, and must make compensation payments on a national basis. The new towns should be at least thirty miles from London, at least fifteen miles from the lesser conurbations' boundaries, and sufficient to care for 1,000,000 people within the next twenty years. Self has dealt, on a reduced scale, with the crux of the metropolitan problems which the U. S. must cope with in the next three decades.

Every one who has even a pretense of knowledge about city planning knows the name of Georges Haussmann, and of his connections with the boulevards of Paris. However, a goodly number of planners and urban sociologists do not know many of the things which

Pinkney tells about this remarkably forceful Prefect of the Seine and about the man whose hireling he was, Napoleon III. It does not take the reader long (perforce with map of Paris in hand—the book does not provide an adequate one) to understand why the period between 1848 and 1870 is perhaps the most remarkable one in the entire history of urban redevelopment, and why Napoleon III and Haussmann occupy such high rank in the minds of those who esteem well designed cities. The commonly held view that the changes which these two wrought on the map of Paris were motivated solely, or even primarily, by the fear of revolt in the easily-barricaded narrow streets of the city, meets strong counter arguments in Pinkney's work. The basic patterns of underground sewers, the tremendous improvements in the city's water supply, the removal of slums, the provision of both small neighborhood parks and the large, internationally known parks, plus the construction of buildings of lasting worth—all of these achievements attest to the extra-militaristic nature of the plans which transformed Paris into one of the most beautiful cities in the world within less than a score of years. The weaknesses of this resourceful pair, such as their failure to check the rebuilding of slums behind acceptable facades, their prejudices (Haussmann was sure that electric lights were injurious to the eyes), and their alleged insensitivities to the more subtle aesthetic values, cannot destroy their standing in the history of men who have conceived of cities as things of beauty as well as of business utility. The book contains excellent photographs, lithographs, and cartoons which are pertinent to the text.

RICHARD DEWEY

University of Illinois

Cities and Society: Revised Reader in Urban Sociology. Edited by PAUL HATT and ALBERT J. REISS, JR. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957. 852 pp. \$7.50.

This new version of the *Reader in Urban Sociology* is an improvement of one of the most useful collections in the literature of sociology. The new introductory essay by Reiss dealing with "The Sociology of Urban Life, 1946-1956," together with expanded introductions to the various sections, raise it above the level of the ordinary "reader." They provide the integration necessary to make it one of the better texts for urban sociology courses.

In addition to the strengthening of the editorial framework, the new edition shows the results of considerable invasion and succession;

twenty-two selections included in the 1951 edition are omitted, and twenty-seven have been added. Aside from the replacement of obsolete descriptive statistics, the change in composition seems to reflect (1) an increasing use of studies based upon the analysis of the census data, (2) the growing importance of sample survey results for the description of urban society, and (3) declining interest in the non-quantitative descriptive or analytical essay. Of the twenty-seven new selections, fifteen are based upon census data, seven on sample surveys, and the remaining five are efforts at theoretical formulation.

Despite the editors' statement in the introductory essay that "a major shift in research emphasis has been a return to the study of social interaction in urban settings," the volume is probably strongest in its presentation of findings from analysis of ecological aggregates and weakest in its presentation of studies in the social structure and social psychology of urban populations. This is mitigated, to a degree, by the use of sample survey descriptions of urban participation. However, the ample survey of a total population is not well suited to the study of group structure. (It would be unfortunate if the primary group came to be defined as a dyad consisting of the respondent and whoever he names as his friend.) The nature of the neighborhood or local community as a framework for studying social groups is not an important focus in the collection. Aside from the brilliant article by Janowitz, the treatment of local areas relies on essays by Whyte, Plant, and Ware. (All are reprinted from the 1951 edition.)

Nor is there adequate treatment of large-scale social structure. The units of analysis tend to be either the total aggregate defined as a city, or the aggregate of individuals defined by the drawing of the sample. There is, for example, no empirical treatment of urban governmental processes as the products of social groups. The polity seems to have dropped out of the metropolis. More emphasis upon control structures, including the corporation, the municipality, the labor union, and other organizational nexuses, should yield a sociological frame of reference.

Such lacunae do not reflect failures on the part of the editors so much as weaknesses in the field. Mr. Reiss comes to the conclusion that there has been "a decline of interest in research on cities and city life, if the research in urban demography and human ecology is excluded from consideration." He explains this as resulting from the specialization and frag-

mentation of the general field of sociology; much that was considered urban sociology is now defined as industrial sociology, stratification, and otherwise. Implicit here is the notion that urban sociology must deal with those aspects of human society which are unique to urban concentrations. However, if this approach is adopted, the urban sociologist is giving up most of the theoretical armament which makes it possible for him to say anything sociologically relevant about the metropolis—and just at the period when the nation is becoming preponderantly urban.

SCOTT GREER

Northwestern University

Small Town in Mass Society: Class, Power and Religion in a Rural Community. By ARTHUR J. VIDICH and JOSEPH BENSMAN. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958. xvi, 329 pp. \$6.00.

Small Town in Mass Society is a welcome addition to the literature concerning American communities. Unlike many of the so-called community studies which simply utilize the community as a research site while studying other phenomena, this is a study of the community itself. Thus, the primary concern of the authors is the system of social relationships among the members of the community and the relationship of this system to the larger social system, the total society, of which it is a part.

The community which Vidich and Bensman studied is located in upstate New York. Springdale, the name given the community by the authors, is roughly coterminous with a small, rural township which has a population of 3,000. One-third of the residents live in a small village whose chief "industry" is a consolidated school, while most of the remainder live in the open country. Continuous settlement in the township dates from 1793. The method of analysis employed is non-quantitative and descriptive, though guided throughout, either explicitly or implicitly, by a fairly sophisticated theoretical framework.

Vidich and Bensman contend that the central fact of life in Springdale's history has been that community's growing dependence on forces originating in the larger society, and especially in the more urbanized segments of that society. These forces impinge on the local community in a host of ways at the present time. In addition to the ubiquitous influence of the mass media, the larger society makes itself felt in Springdale through the impact

of business competition from neighboring communities, the price system, state and national political systems, local organizations whose key roles are filled by imported professionals, and through the migration into the community of industrial workers who commute to neighboring cities.

Because of these developments, the power of local decision-makers over the course of events in Springdale has steadily declined. More and more local leaders find themselves obliged to choose among a narrow range of alternatives defined either by the actions of remote organizations or by the even more impersonal price system. However, within the limits which are open, a small minority of the citizens of the community carry on a lively struggle for power and influence which is vividly described by the authors. Their description of this facet of community life is extremely insightful, and in fact, is probably the best description of decision-making in a local community since *Middletown in Transition*.

A further consequence of the increasing impingement of the larger society which is explored at some length by the authors is the development of serious conflicts between prevailing "social myths" and social reality. No longer does the community even remotely correspond to the idealized image of the self-reliant, self-sufficient community of good neighbors where success is available to all who possess ability and determination. Undoubtedly this image never fully corresponded with reality, but modern Springdalers are inclined to believe it once did, and should still today. The results of this conflict are serious social and psychological stresses which the authors skillfully analyze.

There are, of course, certain aspects of this study which are open to criticism. At times interpretations seem exaggerated. One or two chapters seem weaker than the others. Certain ideas are repeated too often, and a few sentences would have benefited from a more critical editing. Such criticisms seem relatively unimportant, however, in comparison with the overall skill in analysis and presentation displayed. By studying the community as a form of social organization in its own right and as something more than a mere setting for research, and by utilizing an historical perspective in their analysis, Vidich and Bensman have produced a study which this reviewer regards as the best study to date of a rural American community.

GERHARD E. LENSKI

University of Michigan

Community Involvement: The Webs of Formal and Informal Ties That Make for Action.

By CHRISTOPHER SOWER, JOHN HOLLAND, KENNETH TIEDKE, and WALTER FREEMAN. With the cooperation of J. ALLAN BEEGLE, W. B. BROOKOVER, DUANE L. GIBSON, C. R. HOFFER, CHARLES P. LOOMIS, PAUL A. MILLER, DAVID G. STEINICKE, and J. F. THADEN. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957. 323 pp. \$5.00.

The new Director of the Health Department of a county described by the authors as being "thoroughly midwestern in appearance, character, and action" (p. 50), decided to inaugurate a health survey, which he hoped would both provide information about local health needs and increase public awareness of these needs. It was decided that it would be a community self-survey, sponsored by a newly-created Health Council, as part of its efforts to strengthen its program. Coincident with these developments the Health Information Foundation commissioned the authors to study the involvement processes related to the accomplishment of such a survey. Independence County, as it is called, was selected, and this book is a report upon what took place.

The social action program which the survey was designed to set in motion actually amounted to very little. As the authors report it, "nothing or very little seemed to happen as a result of the survey" (p. 249). Even the Health Council, which had sponsored the survey in order to stimulate public interest in a county-wide planning body, died a natural death after the survey report was issued. The death of a voluntary health association is potentially of great sociological interest, but as this one never had widespread public support, its fate reveals little about the life history of mass organizations.

The authors report that the social action program and the Health Council both failed because of "a feeling of indifference on the part of most of the residents of the county about the existence of health problems, at least those which could be solved by voluntary community action" (p. 249). Since the survey was undertaken in large part in order to overcome this indifference, it is worthwhile to examine some other reasons for failure.

The usefulness of community self-surveys, in this reviewer's opinion, is considerably reduced when their educational goals take precedence over research techniques. In the present case, for example, the initial decision to conduct a sample survey was reversed because "if the people of the county were to be made more conscious of health and health problems, then the greater the number of people interviewed in the

survey, the more fully this goal could be realized" (p. 107). As it turned out, many organizations did not complete their assignments, and only some 10,000 out of 18,743 households were interviewed; if any attempt to determine the representativeness of this "sample" was made the authors do not report it. Hence, the fact-gathering goal of the survey—which could have been accomplished by a sample survey—was clearly displaced by the goal of public education—which was not realized either.

Another example is provided by the reversal of the rational decision to wait until September (and the end of urban vacations and summer farm work) to start the field work. A local grange had agreed to cooperate with the survey chiefly in order to compete for a prize offered by Sears, Roebuck for the best community service project completed by a grange; as the contest reports had to be submitted by September 1, the survey was prematurely launched in August. (The fact that this grange actually won the prize seems only to highlight the words of the Archbishop in T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*: "The last temptation is the greatest treason; to do the right deed for the wrong reason.")

To their credit, the authors do not rest satisfied with the usual explanation of "public apathy" for the failure of this self-survey to achieve its ends; instead, they make extensive use of such concepts as culture patterns, legitimization, and informal group relationships, and they present the results of a survey conducted among the nearly 700 volunteer interviewers. But they do not question the strategy of attempting to use participation in social research (as interviewer or respondent) as a method of reducing public apathy. As one minister reported the complaints of his community: "You fellows are getting paid for this but these people, who have to do the dirty work, want to know what is in it for them. You can't blame them for being cool or suspicious of the idea" (p. 143). A more critical assessment of the advantages and drawbacks of community self-surveys would have greatly increased the usefulness of this book.

DAVID L. SILLS

Columbia University

Community Conflict. By JAMES S. COLEMAN. A Publication of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957. 32 pp. \$1.50, paper.

The present effort is commendable, perhaps more for its objectives than for its achievements.

The years since World War II have seen the completion of many empirical studies. Also, they have produced several serious attempts at theory as well as considerable support for the development of theories of the middle range. However, apart from treatments in text books, there have been remarkably few attempts to abstract the common elements from the empirical studies and develop theory inductively. Mr. Coleman makes such an attempt. He states that his purpose is "to lay bare the processes underlying community controversy, and to construct a foundation upon which a theory of community controversy may be built."

Along with his theoretical objective, Coleman has also the very practical aim of providing useful knowledge for administrators who may face conflict situations in the communities with which they deal. If this treatment can be presented to administrators while they are students, the practical aim may be achieved.

In Coleman's thinking, "the social structure of the community is simply the configuration of attachments of individuals to one another and to groups (and the resulting interlocking of groups)." Along with this view of the community, the postulate is stated that "the individual will maximize his action-taking potential by making his attachments consistent." These statements suggest an oversimplification of "community" and of "personality." The accuracy of the postulate and the fruitfulness of this way of looking at the community must be demonstrated by other studies.

Coleman refers to a number of community conflicts reported by journalists; he does not refer to some studies by social scientists, notably *The Social System of the Modern Factory* by Warner and Low, and *Race Riot* by A. M. Lee. Any selection of cases and examples is subject to question, particularly when there is a possibility that the writer may be selecting those which best fit his thesis. This reviewer would find the thesis more convincing if it depended even more upon community studies by social scientists.

Coleman's thesis is abstracted from a number of studies and is succinctly stated. In its present form it is little more than an outline, but he suggests specific research problems which relate to his thesis. Investigation of these should answer most of the questions which may be raised by this publication.

JOHN B. KNOX

The University of Tennessee

American Housing and Its Use: The Demand for Shelter Space. By LOUIS WINNICK, with the assistance of NED SHELLING. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957. xiv, 143 pp. \$5.50.

Farm Housing. By GLEN H. BEYER and J. HUGH ROSE. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957. xi, 194 pp. \$6.00.

These two volumes represent important additions to the Census Monograph Series sponsored by the Bureau of the Census and the Social Science Research Council.

In *American Housing and Its Use* the authors make an economic analysis of the relationship between housing and population characteristics in the urban and rural-nonfarm population, based upon 1950 census data. Supplementary sources have been used to reinforce and extend the data supplied by the census.

The book is made up of eight chapters plus five appendices. The first chapter presents a short summary of the findings and the second discusses the problem of measuring the utilization of housing. Following are four chapters which examine the person-per-room ratio in relation to income, household size, value and rent, and location and race. The two final chapters deal with space trends in the housing inventory and the changing household. The appendices include primarily methodological explanations and supplementary tables.

In *Farm Housing*, a principal purpose, as stated by the authors, was "to determine the extent to which the farm home is a unique phenomenon in the United States housing picture" (p. ix). To present this picture data from the 1950 and 1940 censuses of Population and Housing and the 1950, 1945, and 1940 Censuses of Agriculture have been used.

The book is made up of seven chapters plus five appendices, a glossary and an index. The first chapter discusses classifications basic to the study, and the second details the characteristics of farm housing in 1950. The third and fourth chapters take into consideration the significant differences in farm housing in twelve different geographical regions. The fifth chapter presents an analysis of the impact of urban influences on farm housing and the sixth gives an overall picture of housing occupied by non-white families. The final chapter glances toward the future of farm housing, emphasizes the importance of more research in the field, and suggests channels through which action might be taken to improve farm housing. The appendices contain primarily discussions of methodological problems and supplementary statistical data.

Neither of these books has any serious limita-

tions when seen in the light of the authors' purposes and the data at hand. In both the need for additional study, especially on the qualitative aspects of housing, has been emphasized. Both volumes should be useful to housing experts, governmental agencies, housing planners and builders, and all other groups interested in the problems of housing the nation's people.

MARION T. LOFTIN

Mississippi State College

Chronic Illness in a Large City: The Baltimore Study. Chronic Illness in the United States, Volume IV. By THE COMMISSION ON CHRONIC ILLNESS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957. xxii, 620 pp. \$8.00.

The Commission on Chronic Illness was an independent, voluntary organization which from 1949 to 1956 undertook to review and assess the problem of chronic illness in the United States. Furthermore, it endeavored "to bring order, cohesion and direction to the many related but unintegrated efforts to prevent and control chronic disease and minimize its disabling effects." As a result of its efforts, the Commission issued a series of reports, of which the volume under review is the fourth and last.

In the Baltimore study a representative random sample of the entire population of the city was studied exhaustively to determine (1) the prevalence in it of chronic disease and disability resulting from chronic conditions, (2) the variations in prevalence by age, sex, color, economic level, and other significant social and economic factors, (3) the needs of the chronically ill for care, including the rehabilitative potential of chronically ill and disabled individuals, and (4) ways of studying the nature and size of the chronic disease problem. What happened and what was found are the core of the report (Parts II-V). Part VI deals with methods of studying chronic disease in the general population. In addition, a series of appendices provide a detailed description and discussion of the methodology of the study. These sections are undoubtedly of great interest to all concerned with morbidity studies, especially those based on interviews with members of households.

It is impossible to discuss the manifold points of interest in this massive volume, which will repay close scrutiny. Some, however, may be mentioned and their implications indicated. For one thing, the prevalence rates for various chronic conditions were found to be far above any previously reported, a finding even more striking in view of the fact that institutionalized persons were not included in the survey. On the

other hand, in view of the high prevalence rates it is important to note that only one-eighth of the conditions were judged to be severe. Another 25 per cent were considered moderately severe. More than half (56 per cent) were judged to be substantial, but less than half the people (44 per cent) had a substantial condition. The authors also point out that a case-by-case comparison of household interview reports with clinical diagnoses in the evaluation clinic showed that less than one quarter of all conditions diagnosed by clinical examination were reported in the preceding household interview.

Another area of considerable importance is that of attitudes toward health conditions. This problem found its reflection in the response rate to various activities involved in the survey, but more specifically to the application of available diagnostic and therapeutic measures and facilities. These attitudes are by no means easy to elicit or to analyze, yet if progress is to be made in the improvement of health through community action this question must be studied more thoroughly than it has been so far. Here is an area where social science research, if carried out with imagination, perseverance, and in terms of relevant theoretical systems, would be of infinitely more value than any research into how the public can be "scientifically" engineered into buying a certain type of car.

To sum it up: This is an important study of an important American problem. It will be of interest to those concerned with methods of community study, to those who wish to understand the nature and extent of a major and increasingly important socio-medical problem, and to those who wish to understand better the mainsprings of human behavior so as to be able to act more intelligently and effectively within American communities.

GEORGE ROSEN

Columbia University

Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

Edited by THOMAS FITZSIMMONS. Country Survey Series. Contributors: CLIFFORD R. BARNETT, JOHN C. FISKE, PETER MALOF, and FLORENCE K. NIERMAN. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, 1957. Vol. I, xii, 310 pp.; vol. II, 350 pp. \$9.75 (both vols.).

The authors of these two volumes state in the introduction that "the Soviet society, is the product of many factors, and the behavior of the Soviet citizens cannot be explained as being simply the result of his training in infancy, of his ancient heritage, of the land and climate in which he lives, or of the rulers who govern him." The Soviet citizen is a composite of all

those things, and the authors, approaching the problem on the basis of their respective disciplines, account well for this multiplicity of factors, indicating their awareness of the constant interplay of forces shaping the character of the Soviet citizen and of the society of which he is a part.

Theoretically, this study concentrates upon the RSFSR noting that the RSFSR is only one of the fifteen Socialist Soviet Republics which are the constituent members of the USSR. In fact, this study is the study of the whole political, economic, and social unit; much that is included in these two volumes applies to the USSR as a whole.

The present study consists of twenty-four text chapters which can be readily classified into five parts. Part I introduces the reader to problems of historical developments, geography, and population characteristics, with separate chapters dealing with language and the ethnic groups. Linguists and students of population and minorities will find these chapters highly interesting and relatively complete.

Part II includes chapters on the legal and the theoretical base of the government, governmental structure, and the dynamics of political behavior. The accompanying graphs and tables contribute further to the straightforward and careful presentation of political structures, lines of authority, and official communication systems.

Two chapters deal with the diffusion of control and information and the effects of national attitudes on domestic and foreign policies, preceded by a discussion of the definition and enforcement of public order. The former chapters would be of considerable interest to the students of public opinion and communication systems, while the latter should be often referred to by criminologists and penologists.

Seven chapters deal with economic problems. The discussion is both general (and thus useful to all of the behavioral sciences), and particular (with characteristic, detailed illustrations of interest to area specialists).

The fifth and final part includes a more specialized discussion of the following areas: public health and welfare, social organization, the family, education, artistic and intellectual achievement, religion, and social values and patterns of living. The mixture of the general and the specific is employed here with great skill and makes this study interesting and uniquely informative. However, it would probably be more advantageous to the internal structure of the publication if the chapter on social organization (Chapter XIX) and the one on social values and patterns of living (Chapter XXIV) were placed in Part I of the book.

One of the greatest values of these volumes, besides the encyclopedic and integrated data dealing with the RSFSR, lies in the voluminous bibliography selected on the basis of quality and general availability and including the list of publications prepared by the Human Relations Area Files and the up-to-date bibliography of sources processed by the HRAF on the RSFSR. Frequent illustrative quotations, limited maps and tables, and a glossary of commonly used terms contribute considerably to this uniquely informative study.

WITOLD KRASSOWSKI

Santa Clara University

Land of Choice: The Hungarians in Canada.

By JOHN KOSA. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957. 104 pp. \$3.50.

Contemporary studies of Canada's minority groups are so few that any scholarly monograph is a welcome addition, even if it tells us far less than we would like to know about matters of sociological interest. Professor Kosa's book is of sufficient merit that its brevity is tantalizing.

The limitations of the study are due largely to the author's modest definition of his problem and to the nature of his main source of data. He sets out to study the "adjustment and assimilation" of those Hungarian-Canadians in Ontario who came before 1930. His data are derived chiefly from informal interviews with a sample of 112 males and (it turned out) their wives, and also from participation in the life of the group and reading of the ethnic press. The second generation and later immigrants are not within his ambit, so a systematic account of ethnic organizations is not attempted and the reader must try to understand portions of the anatomy without the skeleton. Such allusions as the following—not further explained—lead us to believe that we are missing much: "The Hungarian group is extremely atomized in its social structure and is divided into small, often hostile sub-groups" (p. 60). We are told something of the system of stratification within the group as it affects the pre-1930 immigrants but the author gives us only a glimpse of the complications that result when post-war immigrants from higher classes confront prosperous former peasants who outrank them according to North American standards.

Two aspects of the assimilation process are treated particularly well. The first is the role of the strong system of obligations among kindred in making possible the migration to Canada and in providing a solidary grouping for mutual aid in the early years of adjustment. The second is the central importance of economic success

in determining the rate of assimilation. Because the author has obtained an unusual amount of information about the financial affairs of the people in his sample, he is able to trace in detail the early activities based on the peasant patterns of thrift and family labor, the consequent rapid accumulation of property when the war brought new opportunities, and the far-reaching effects of getting on the consumption escalator.

The author also discusses changes in marriage and the conjugal family, in clothing, food and housing, and in the values surrounding drinking, physical violence, and birth control. It is to be hoped that this small study is only the beginning of Professor Kosa's research and publication in the field.

P. J. GIFFEN

University of Toronto

New India's Rivers. By HENRY C. HART. Bombay: Orient Longmans, 1956. Distributed by the Institute of Pacific Relations, New York 14. xi, 301 pp. No price indicated.

New India's Rivers is a readable, enthusiastic book about the men, machines, leadership, and changing culture patterns and policies involved in the tremendous river development program into which India is putting about one-fourth of the nation's savings, the technical skills of many of its own fine engineers and the engineers of other nations.

In the first chapter, "Descent of the Ganga," Hart shows the awe and the love which the people of India have for their rivers. Here snatches of the folklore, the songs and poetry which have been written about their rivers, especially the Indus and the Ganga, are given. In this chapter he shows that "Rivers, like all else in India, pulsate to the annual beat of the Monsoon." Hart pays adequate tribute to both British and Indian engineers who were forerunners of the present Indian river development.

One of the most interesting chapters has to do with building of the dam on the Tungabhadra River between the states of Hyderabad and Madras. The dam was built from opposite banks of the river with two independent builders, two chief engineers, and with the government of India having only rarely to referee disputes.

The great Damodar Valley development comes in for adequate treatment in a chapter on "Flood, Famine and Foresight." The success of the project, Hart believes, has been due to the four features of the development: "(1) The Damodar scheme was founded by law . . .; (2) The founders of the Damodar scheme deliberately set about finding an administrative in-

strument that would exactly fit the job in hand . . . ; (3) The physical plan was comprehensive . . . and (4) The Damodar River was tackled, not upon engineering formulae alone, but for the good it might do the people it reaches . . ." (p. 78). The administrative vehicle was The Damodar Valley Corporation, not unlike its analogue, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Hart feels that India is finding in its river valley developments answers not only as to what dams to build, where to build them and how to build them, but also how to govern them. Damodar has a corporation. On the Manhanadi an organization within a regular government department is in charge. These two organizations and their plans are contrasted in detail.

Hart feels that India's dams and river developments are monuments to the universal mind of science. Mahatma Gandhi lived only to see some of the projects begun. It remained for Jawaharlal Nehru to exclaim, in dedicating a dam and canal: "Where can be a greater and holier place than this?"

WILLIAM E. COLE

University of Tennessee

The Population of Jamaica. By GEORGE W. ROBERTS. With an introduction by KINGSLEY DAVIS. Cambridge: At the University Press for The Conservation Foundation, 1957. xxii, 356 pp. \$7.50.

Mr. Roberts, for some years Vital Statistics Officer of the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation (Barbados), has made a substantial contribution to demographic knowledge in this well ordered, meticulous, and imaginative study. Exhaustive use is made of both contemporary statistics and historical records. The former is done always with an awareness of their limitations—there are virtually no cases of over-interpretation. The latter is done with a sensitivity to the possibilities of historical documentation too often lacking in demographic writing. Historical information and actuarial records are used to define and illuminate contemporary trends as well as for the purposes of reconstruction. For instance, the discussion of fertility and mortality during and following slavery is particularly good.

The major emphasis of the study is on factors contributing to population growth. Vital factors, therefore, receive the most attention; migration, both external and internal, runs a strong second, and questions of composition and the like are merely also-rans. Because Jamaica is a "multi-racial" society, one would have welcomed additional attention to these aspects of its population.

Technically, the work is impeccable and often highly ingenious, for example, in the application of the life-table method to the understanding of migration statistics. Pointed comparative comment on other places, chiefly in the British West Indies, enhances the value of interpretation.

A few minor points may warrant argument. Roberts asserts (p. 29) that "The indigenous inhabitants have contributed nothing to [Jamaica's] present population." Sociologically this is undoubtedly true, but genetically it seems rather improbable. He suggests (p. 66) that the Syrians "may be confounded with the . . . Jews." Although this is possible, it is more likely to occur in Trinidad than in Jamaica, and he may be reasoning from his Eastern Caribbean experience. But these are inconsequential quibbles. The book is mandatory reading for students of population and can be examined with profit by general sociologists, especially those interested in social change, the family, and research methods.

LEONARD BROOM

The Australian National University

My Mother Who Fathered Me: A Study of the Family in Three Selected Communities in Jamaica. By EDITH CLARKE. With a Preface by SIR HUGH FOOT. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1957. 216 pp. 18s. net.

Miss Clarke's book is both a welcome addition to the literature on the West Indian family and something of a disappointment to the analytical sociologist in its relative lack of concern with general theoretical problems. The material is arranged to highlight certain practical problems of social administration as well as to demonstrate limited hypotheses concerning variation in family structure within the Jamaican context. It must be judged primarily as an attempt to uncover the genesis of social ills and not as an attempt to place Jamaican family forms in a wide comparative framework.

As Director of the West Indian Social Survey, Miss Clarke (assisted by a field staff of seven Jamaicans) made intensive studies of three communities chosen mainly on the basis of their varying modes of economic activity: a sugar plantation area, an extremely poor peasant farming village, and a relatively prosperous community of citrus farmers. As the very excellent title of the book suggests she was particularly concerned with the incidence, causes, and effects of paternal "irresponsibility," and in the course of her discussion of this problem she presents much valuable information on the nature and patterning of kinship relations in the three field centers. Her conclusions are not stated explicitly,

but in the very limitation of her empirical interests it is clear that she considers the joint ownership of land to be the basis of kinship solidarity, that legal Christian marriage is the expression of satisfactory family adjustment, that the latter is dependent upon economic sufficiency, and that it confers added social status. She demonstrates the fact that societal norms of legal Christian marriage are institutionalized at all levels of the social hierarchy, and that no matter how stable other patterns may be they are in one sense a deviation from this norm. However, apart from emphasizing class differences and economic factors as giving rise to these deviant patterns she does not succeed in carrying her analysis far enough to show why such deviant patterns persist within the overall structure of Jamaican society, and the reader is given very little idea of what "social class" means in this context.

The chapters on land tenure and household composition are the best in the book, containing as they do the real core of the field data which will be useful to future students of the area.

R. T. SMITH

University of California, Berkeley

The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups.

Edited by JACK GOODY. Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology, No. 1. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1958. vii, 145 pp. \$4.00, paper.

It is nearly universal in human society that residence shifts at marriage for the wife, the husband, or both, but until recently students of social structure have paid little attention to the fact that the domestic group passes through a cycle of developmental phases and that its personnel varies correspondingly. Meyer Fortes in his Introduction to this collection of papers develops the above thesis as part of a general theory of the dynamics of social systems.

J. D. Freeman, in the first of four examples, describes a Borneo society in which residence at marriage is "utrolocal," that is, with the premarital domestic group of either spouse, the choice (according to Fortes in the Introduction) depending upon the relative developmental phases of the two domestic groups. If at a later phase the expanded domestic group includes two or more married heirs, it is itself subject to partition.

Jack Goody compares two neighboring tribes in Ghana in which membership of domestic groups varies with the descent system. Where descent and inheritance are patrilineal, grown sons remain longer with their fathers' domestic

groups in which they have full rights of inheritance; but where two principles of descent are recognized, sons early establish independent units of production so that the fruits of their labors will not pass to their cousins through matrilineal inheritance.

Derrick J. Stenning describes the developmental cycle of the Fulani domestic group in which cattle are gradually transferred to sons until, when the last son has married, the father finds himself without property and wholly dependent upon his eldest heir.

In what is perhaps the most brilliant of these papers, E. R. Leach shows that it is more logical to assume that Trobriand kin terms refer to categories of persons defined by age and related to ego by their membership in local groups with which his own group exchanges food, than to categories defined by descent or by rules of preferential marriage. Since ego shifts his residence in a certain phase of his own development, here again the developmental cycle of the local group is a factor. Certain anomalies of kin terminology, for which Malinowski offered a forced explanation in terms of homonyms, disappear in Leach's analysis.

As is to be expected in the analysis of the internal structure of dynamic systems, concepts devised for the description of static systems must be refined and the social units defined with greater precision. These students add their bit to the expanding vocabulary and to the increasing need for a symbolism and an algebra of social structure.

GORDON D. GIBSON

University of Utah

The Social Psychology of Music. By PAUL R. FARNSWORTH. New York: The Dryden Press, 1958. xiv, 304 pp. \$4.50.

More properly titled "The Psychology of Music," this book is an attempt to present "a coherent picture . . . of the field, its major problems, and the solutions [the author] deems most plausible." Specifically, it reviews the literature of experimental research in the field.

The title, "Social Psychology," is justified by the author's statement that "during the three decades . . . he has been occupied with . . . research . . . [he] has finally adopted a relativistic, culturally oriented point of view." While one may wonder that it should have taken such long travail to arrive at a position which is the ideological habitat of most social scientists and which could have been readily derived from historical and comparative analysis, nevertheless the material here reviewed is welcome additional

evidence for those interested in the sociology of art.

From a survey of experimental research in scales and tonalities, pitch intervals, consonance and dissonance, major and minor modalities, and musical tastes and abilities, Farnsworth is able to show complete failure in the persistent attempts to ground the elements of music either biologically, in the neuro-physiology of the human ear and constitution, or, physically, in the mechanics and mathematical physics of the nature of sound. The evidence is demonstrably for nurture as against nature, and since nurture occurs in and through a group context interpretation is clearly on the psycho-social level.

Thus, the conclusions abound with such statements as: "Music is made of socially accepted patterns of sounds." "Any scale is . . . a phenomenon of social agreement." ". . . consonance and dissonance . . . are learned responses, adaptations to an existing pattern of the social group." ". . . melody . . . seems best defined in terms of learning . . . in a social organization which brings to our attention certain sequences. . . . Theoretically . . . any sequence of tones could conceivably constitute a melody for some culture group." "All the evidence . . . points to the relativity of taste . . . that it is culture-bound. . . . The descriptions sociology gives of mores fit taste most exactly."

To arrive at a social point of view is merely to define the problem, not to solve it, and Farnsworth readily admits that hardly a beginning has been made in answering the problems of musical esthetics. Yet in attempting to cover the literature in a small volume he is unable to develop many social and esthetic implications. For instance, he deals rather peremptorily with the research of H. T. Moore, from which A. Chandler, in his *Beauty and Human Nature* (1934), was able to construct a hypothesis for the development of consonance, historically and individually, in a sequential pattern of stages from dissonance to consonance—a hypothesis bristling with implications for musical esthetics and music education.

Natural science-oriented psychologists will have some difficulty in learning what questions to ask on the social level and may be expected to turn to sociology for guidance. Unfortunately, many psychologists, like many sociologists, combine great methodological sophistication with considerable esthetic naivete. Even Farnsworth is not wholly free of this deficiency, as in his chapter on music as a language, which treats solely of extra-musical imagery without making clear its esthetic irrelevance compared to the communication of general affective states and,

most important of all for music as an art, the communication of musical ideas.

ADOLPH S. TOMARS

The City College of New York

The Community: An Introduction to a Social System. By IRWIN T. SANDERS. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1958. xvi, 431 pp. \$6.00.

Professor Sanders indicates in the Preface that his book is designed for use as an undergraduate textbook. It assumes only an introductory background in sociology, seeks to present the characteristics of all communities, and emphasizes "orientation and the general conceptual framework." Although the author presents no claim that his book is an original contribution to sociology, it is, nonetheless, important as an attempt to analyze the human community in terms of concepts drawn from modern theory.

In organization, the volume is more traditional than its subtitle suggests. Eleven chapters are devoted to a discussion of the "social traits" of the community: the community as a place, demographic characteristics, structure and functions as a service center, communication network, values, social strata, groups, interaction processes, social change, control, and a summary which spells out the necessary components of all communities. Part II deals with institutions: government, economy, family, religion, education, health and welfare, and recreation, and concludes with an analysis of the basic "operations" of all communities. Part III is made up of two chapters on planning and development.

The book is well written. It assumes, however, a level of conceptual sophistication which the undergraduate with only an introductory sociology background may lack—but it makes up for this minor deficiency with clarity of definition and the inclusion of numerous illustrations, cases, and reference sources.

Although Professor Sanders makes use throughout his text of rather sophisticated (for an undergraduate) conceptual schemes (e.g., Florence R. Kluckhohn's "Dominant and Variant Value Orientations" in Chapter 5), it is especially in Chapters 11 and 18 that he seeks to make an original theoretical contribution to the understanding of community structures and processes. The "setting" of the community system is presented as a coexistence of culture, personality, ecology, and demography—all, of course, changing through time. The community as a social system is described in terms of its major parts: the person (as a type, e.g., parent); social relationships (two or more people or units

in social contact, e.g., teacher-pupil); social groups (three or more people in social contact, e.g., the household); social groupings (categories of people having common attributes, e.g., aliens); subsystems (widespread social networks, e.g., transportation); and major systems (institutionalized units, e.g., family). Further analysis of these components is then presented, e.g., social groupings are classified into those based on the following kinds of criteria: biological (and here one may quarrel mildly with the inclusion of "nationalities" under this category), economic, social, personal achievement, and common interests.

In Chapter 18, the author makes an interesting distinction between "processes" (defined as "descriptive terms for a series of observable acts occurring between components of the system"—conflict, regimentation, and socialization are examples) and "operations" (which "have to do with the behavior of the whole system and describe the behavior within the system which keeps it going as a system"—recruitment of new members, communication, allocation of prestige, and integration through adjustment are examples). In one instance, socialization, a process, is also considered an operation. On p. 345, Sanders presents a table showing where each of these operations was discussed in previous chapters; this reviewer believes it would have added to the value of the book had his theoretical scheme been spelled out fully in an early chapter so that the student reader could find out, before covering more than three-fourths of the book, what kind of total creature he was anatomizing and with what conceptual tools. Moreover, Professor Sanders' typology of "operations" is not much different from earlier discussions of social requisites, especially those of Parsons, Levy, and Davis.

Other minor cavils may be made: the small allotment of space devoted to family and religion; the regret that the author did not attempt (as he makes clear on p. 203) to use the same set of categories for the analysis of all institutions; a definition of social structure ("all the social relationships in a community viewed from the status standpoint") which seems to place unnecessary emphasis upon status, but which, fortunately, is not evident elsewhere in the book; the statement that "perhaps the process most consciously stressed in American communities is that of competition," which may be questioned by some who think there is an overemphasis on "adjustment" and "cooperativeness" in schools, families, clubs, and, indeed, whole communities.

But these are minor criticisms. Professor Sanders has written a book for which all of us

interested in the study of communities can be grateful. I expect to use it with profit in my classes.

BLAINE E. MERCER

University of Colorado

Population in Its Human Aspects. By HAROLD A. PHELPS and DAVID HENDERSON. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958. xvi, 512 pp. \$6.00.

In this book the authors' purpose is "to study population from the combined insights derived from many disciplines . . . to combine an understanding of measurements and other numerical contributions with an interpretation of people and societies in their demographic relationships." The book is divided into six parts on such general topics as growth, distribution, racial and ethnic composition, and quality. Quite lengthy and useful bibliographies are at the end of each of the twenty-one chapters, and there is a short appendix on "methods and research problems."

It is not easy to determine the kind of audience for which this book is intended. Although obviously an elementary textbook, it can hardly be meant to compete with such population texts as Thompson's *Population Problems*. Nor does it seem suitable for courses on social problems, despite the considerable space devoted to their discussion. Whole chapters, for instance those on "health," "mental defects," "the socially inadequate," are of the type most often found in problems texts, while large portions of other chapters are devoted to additional problems. But the limited range of such topics and their generally non-analytical treatment seem enough to restrict the book's usefulness for courses in this area.

For the authors, "demographic" seems to encompass all measurable human characteristics. Useful as such breadth may be, it tends in this book to result in a hodgepodge of random statistical presentations, often devoid of any systematic relationships with one another. The authors' failure to organize the discussion of these data around the basic demographic variables—fertility, mortality, and migration—merely adds to the confusion.

Despite frequent use of the word, this volume contains little of what has come to be termed "demography." The population statistics presented are used to introduce the discussions of social problems to a greater extent than to deal with demographic variables in their own right or to illuminate the connections between such variables and other social conditions. The frameworks for demographic analysis used most extensively are the Pearl-Reed growth

curve, generally out-moded by post-World War II conditions, and Sumner's man-land ratio. Glick's family life cycle and the demographic transition are mentioned. The discussion of the latter, however, omits notation of the fact that at any particular time the vital rates themselves are of relatively minor importance as compared with the question of whether or not fertility and mortality have been brought under control.

Finally, when it is remembered that the very stimulus to population study today arises so often from concern with conditions in the other 94 percent of the world, it seems curious that, except for parts of only three chapters, the authors should limit their discussion to conditions in the United States.

LINCOLN H. DAY

Mount Holyoke College

The Skills of the Economist. By KENNETH E. BOULDING. Cleveland: Howard Allen, Inc., 1958. vi, 193 pp. \$3.50.

Nowadays, as economists wrangle over tax cuts, spending programs, gentle inflation, and long-term price stabilization, it is particularly challenging to outline the unique skills of the economist and their policy applications. Professor Boulding accepts this challenge. To use his recurring analogy, the relationship between the economist's skills and policy parallels the relationship between the carpenter's skills and woodworking.

The volume's contents might be divided as follows: (1) excellent elementary expositions of economists' devices, such as marginal analysis, the Keynesian model of aggregate behavior, etc.; (2) attempts to relate such devices to business practice and governmental policy; (3) a sketchy outline for inter-disciplinary cooperation and for an ethical program. Given Professor Boulding's aim—to demonstrate the usefulness of the economist's specific skills—the third is least convincing; he stretches the imagination too far,

for instance, in suggesting that study of the opportunity and preference functions illuminates the shifting Communist party line. Certainly one might describe Communist tactics by such a concept, but it produces no special facts, insights, analytical relationships, or policies which other frames of reference do not produce as well or better.

With regard to the less sweeping application of skills to policy, Professor Boulding's treatment leaves some confusion. First he outlines a skill such as marginal analysis. In terms of policy, however, this skill produces an anticlimactic "careful weighing of gains and losses from small changes" (p. 64), which could be the result of intelligence unaided by marginal analysis. Indeed, Professor Boulding concedes that this advice depends more on "an awareness of the concrete reality around [the economist]" (p. 64) than the skill of marginal analysis. Phrases such as "a turn of mind" (p. 65) and "the way in which an economist thinks" (p. 123) recur. Hence the carpenter analogy flatters the economist a little. The carpenter uses his specific talents and his tools, not an admixture of skills and "turns of mind," to build houses.

Is not the actual relationship among the economist's assumptions, skills, and advice thus more complex than Professor Boulding suggests? The economist possesses certain general assumptions concerning men and commodities. Using these assumptions, he has developed a number of advanced skills. When he considers policy, however, he often returns, as Professor Boulding realizes, to these assumptions, to very general analytical results, or to general experience. Perhaps this reliance on assumptions and "turns of mind" accounts for some of the policy disagreements and predictive failures among economists—neither of which carpenters experience, because their aims and skills are more adequately geared to their tasks.

NEIL J. SMELSER

Harvard University

BOOK NOTES

How They Became Governor: A Study of Comparative State Politics, 1870-1950. By JOSEPH A. SCHLESINGER. Foreword by ROBERT A. DAHL. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957. 103 pp. No price indicated.

There have been relatively few systematic or thoughtful analyses of career patterns in American politics. Indeed, those studies we have of American political leadership usually reflect the

tendency to generalize from the lives of a few extraordinary men rather than to survey the larger numbers of more conventional leaders who govern most Americans most of the time.

Professor Schlesinger's study attempts to deal with this lack of information; it also leads him into another field in which there is little exact knowledge, that of comparative state political systems in the United States. He analyzes the careers of all the men who served as governors of American states between 1870 and 1950, and

attempts to develop some generalizations about politics in the forty-eight states. He also develops some interesting sub-patterns for certain selected states.

His study shows that career lines of political leaders do not develop at random, but rather as an "expression" of the political system of each state, and, one might add, of its social system as well. One section of the book, for example, deals with the hypothesis that as social and economic differences widen within a state, the state legislature will become less important as a rung in the career ladder—because legislative districts, becoming more heterogeneous, will shape a man's political career so that he cannot later appear to represent the whole state as a homogeneous entity. This trend is reflected in the declining importance of the legislature as a step to power since 1870, and would seem to have its parallels on the national scene.

Moving into the relatively uncharted field of state politics in relation to state social systems, Schlesinger argues that a more or less permanent minority party within a state may serve as a "convenient depository" for social conflict. The existence of such a depository, like a tenderloin district for the lower classes, not only helps to blur over conflict by removing it from "political visibility" (another good Schlesinger phrase) but also permits greater internal control of the majority party by its governing elite. Such an arrangement has existed in many states, although, as in Massachusetts since 1930, the old majority always runs a risk of having the "depository of conflict" become the new governing party.

There are many other stimulating analyses of state systems in the book; in general, Schlesinger's study will unquestionably add to the limited number of political cases with which the social scientist must work.—JOHN P. MALLAN

The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933. By GILMAN M. OSTRANDER. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957. vi, 241 pp. \$5.00, paper.

Historical monographs are often unsatisfying to a social scientist, and this one is no exception. True, the activities and ideas of a great many individuals and organizations are described minutely and with care, but there is no frame of reference to give meaning to all these details. Hence, the few interpretative passages which appear unexpectedly here and there are necessarily impressionistic and undeveloped.

The concept of social movement is itself nowhere defined or discussed (or really employed), nor is there a reference to the pioneering study of movements by Jerome Davis or to

the later work of Blumer or of Heberle. Lee's analysis of the prohibitionists is likewise ignored.

As a chronological description of the emergence, growth, and virtual demise of prohibitionism in California, however, this is a complete and careful piece of work. There is some value in it as a factual source for students of social change, organization, and movements. Among its interesting sidelights are accounts of the schisms among temperance groups and their sometimes bitter battles with the clergy, the rather surprising lack of unity among the wets, and a thorough documenting of the ineffectualness of national prohibition. While the writing is respectably undramatic, there are many bright spots of humor, somewhat restrained but certainly not dry.—

C. WENDELL KING

UNESCO: Purpose, Progress, Prospects. By WALTER H. C. LAVES and CHARLES A. THOMSON. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957. xxiii, 469 pp. \$7.50.

This useful general survey, handbook, and catalog achieves wide historical and descriptive coverage, but only at the cost of deeper analysis. The opening section (65 pp.) deals concisely but well with UNESCO's antecedents, establishment, and early indecisions concerning purpose. The subsequent lengthy (213 pp.) project-by-project listing of all UNESCO's activities is more overwhelming but less impressive. Spiced among the descriptions of the many projects deemed praiseworthy are several refreshingly blunt and honest comments on failures and several criticisms of policy. The final section (59 pp.) treats briefly internal administration, personalities and programs of the three Directors General, and relations with member States and National Commissions. The disappointing conclusion (14 pp.) restates themes already introduced and emphasizes the silver lining in the cloudy history of UNESCO. The statements, without elaboration, of UNESCO problems and activities are brief, clear, and well-balanced. It is to the authors' credit that when they oversimplify or duck a definition, they say so.

The extensive Notes (56 pp.) contain many fascinating tidbits of sometimes questionable importance. Unfortunately, they have squeezed a proper bibliography out of the book. Yet scattered through these Notes in a relatively unusable manner there is mention of almost all the relevant literature in English, including many of the less-well-known secondary works as well as a scattering of French, German and Spanish items. A documentary and statistical Appendix is included.—A. B. OVERSTREET

Multivariate Correlational Analysis. By PHILIP H. DuBois. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958. xv, 202 pp. \$4.50.

This book is primarily concerned with the systematic aspects of linear correlational procedures. It considers the nature of r and multiple R , the relation of multiple to partial correlation, and the relation of both multiple and partial correlation to factor analysis. Although the work of a psychologist, the focus is more on the formal structure of multivariate analysis than on the applicability of that method to problems in the social and psychological sciences. Consequently, the formulation will probably be more meaningful to the statistician than to the social scientist.

However, the book may be profitably consulted by all research workers in need of efficient computing routines. The author counts as one of the advantages of his formulation the expeditious computing procedures to which it gives rise. He gives as an example the calculation of multiple R without the final regression weights, the appropriate procedure where the interest is in correlation rather than prediction.

Understandably, this volume cannot be expected to attract as much attention in sociology as in psychology. Multivariate analysis has not been so widely used in sociology. It will be more extensively used and its possibilities more fully explored in the measure that sociologists acquire a working knowledge of the system so lucidly presented by Professor DuBois.—KARL F. SCHUESSLER

Sociología General. By ANTONIO PERPIÑA RODRIGUEZ. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956. 487 pp. 140 pesetas.

This long, sometimes confused, and even downright chaotic attempt to establish the foundations of an "individualistic, spiritualistic" sociology is marred by a generally eclectic approach which does not preclude harsh dogmatism. The first part, *Nature of Sociology*, is perhaps the most interesting. It deals with the development of three mutually exclusive schools

of sociology: German formalism and idealism, the French School from Comte and Durkheim to Tarde, and American empiricist and anthropological studies (this latter trend being strongly attacked and rejected *in toto*). The second, third and fourth parts (*Essence of the Social Phenomenon, Social Forms, and Social Contents*) are strongly influenced by Neo-Thomism, some French Catholic essayists such as Le Play and Hauriou, and by Luigi Sturzo. Although occasionally interesting and even brilliant, these parts suffer from the fact that the author is often compelled to accept analyses and viewpoints coming from other, "incompatible" sociological trends, especially German formalism.—MANUEL DURAN

La Sociología Científica (Apuntes para su Fundamentación). By GINO GERMANI. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Nacional, 1956. 156 pp. No price indicated.

This excellent little book deals with problems of method in sociology. The author points out the dangers both of "planless empiricism" and *a priori* philosophical structuralism. He seems thoroughly informed about the latest publications in the U. S., France, Germany, and, of course, in Latin America. As an Argentine, he seems to be at the crossroads of the different national schools of sociology. He believes an international synthesis is still to be achieved; his book was conceived as a step in this direction. For Germani, a thorough and objective description of existing social phenomena is the indispensable foundation of any sociological theory. His favorite authors are: in the U. S., W. I. Thomas and F. Zaniecki; in France, Durkheim (who, according to him, has only been partially outdated and is still in some respects an influential master); in Germany, L. von Wiese and K. Mannheim. Germani propounds a "creative feedback," controlled by reason and common sense, between theory and description of existing phenomena. Highly recommended reading for any American sociologist who can read Spanish.—MANUEL DURAN

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(Listing of a publication below does not preclude its subsequent review)

- ABEGGLEN, JAMES G. *The Japanese Factory: Aspects of Its Social Organization*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958. xiii, 142 pp. \$3.50.
- ALLAN, W. SCOTT. *Rehabilitation: A Community Challenge*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958. xvi, 247 pp. \$5.75.
- ANASTASI, ANNE. *Differential Psychology: Individual and Group Differences in Behavior*. Third Edition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1958. xii, 664 pp. \$7.50.
- ANDERSON, WALTER A. *The Characteristics of New York State Population*. Bulletin 925, February 1958. Ithaca: Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, New York State College of Agriculture, 1958. 70 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- ANGELL, ROBERT COOLEY. *Free Society and Moral Crisis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958. viii, 252 pp. \$6.00.
- BADEN-POWELL, B. H. *The Indian Village Community*. New Haven: HRAF Press, 1957. xvi, 456 pp. \$3.95.
- BAHRDT, HANS PAUL. *Industriebürokratie: Versuch einer Soziologie des industriellen Bürobetriebes und seiner Angestellten*. Soziologische Gegenwartsfragen—Neue Folge. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke Verlag, 1958. viii, 146 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- BELL, DANIEL. *Work and Its Discontents: The Cult of Efficiency in America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1956. 56 pp. No price indicated.
- BLOCH, J. M. *Miscegnation, Melaleukation and Mr. Lincoln's Dog*. New York: Schaum Publishing Co., 1958. 69 pp. No price indicated.
- BOLLENS, JOHN C. *Special District Governments in the United States*. Foreword by JOHN M. GAUS. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. xiv, 280 pp. \$4.50.
- BUDGE, SIR WALLIS. *Egyptian Magic*. Evanston & New York: University Books, 1958. xv, 234 pp. \$5.00.
- CALDER, RITCHIE. *Medicine and Man: The Story of the Art and Science of Healing*. New York: New American Library, 1958. (A Mentor Book). viii, 256 pp. Fifty cents, paper.
- CARR-SAUNDERS, SIR ALEXANDER. *Natural Science and Social Science*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1958. 15 pp. Three shillings, paper.
- CARTER, GWENDOLEN M. *The Politics of Inequality: South Africa Since 1948*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1958. 535 pp. \$7.50.
- CAVALLI, LUCIANO. *Inchiesta Sugli Abituri*. Le Inchieste Dell'Ufficio Studi Sociali e Del Lavoro Del Comune di Genova, No. 1. Prefazione di GIANNI BAGET-BOZZO. Genova, Italy: Studi Sociali e del Lavoro, 1958. xv, 111 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- CAVALLI, LUCIANO. *Quartiere Operaio*. Prefazione di GIANNI BAGET-BOZZO. Genova: Studi Sociali e del Lavoro, n.d. xxiii, 148 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- CHALL, JEANNE S. *Readability: An Appraisal of Research and Application*. Bureau of Educational Research Monographs, No. 34. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1958. xiv, 202 pp. \$3.00, paper.
- CLARK, SIR GEORGE. *War and Society in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. vii, 152 pp. \$3.75.
- COLE, WILLIAM E. *Urban Society: A College Textbook in Urban Sociology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958. 591 pp. \$6.50.
- COLLINS, SYDNEY. *Coloured Minorities in Britain: Studies in British Race Relations based on African, West Indian and Asiatic Immigrants*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1957. 258 pp. 21/- s. net.
- (COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT). *Anti-Recession Policy for 1958: A Statement by The Program Committee*. New York: CED, March, 1958. 30 pp. Twenty cents, paper.
- (COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT). *Economic Growth in the United States: Its Past and Future*. A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee. New York: CED, February, 1958. 63 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- CONYBEARE, FREDERICK CORNWALLIS. *The Origins of Christianity*. Evanston & New York: University Books, 1958. xxx, 382 pp. \$6.00.
- COULT, LYMAN H., JR. *An Annotated Research Bibliography of Studies in Arabic, English, and French of the Fellah of the Egyptian Nile, 1798-1955*. With the assistance of KARIM DURZI. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1958. v, 144 pp. No price indicated.
- COYLE, GRACE LONGWELL and MARGARET E. HARTFORD. *Social Process in the Community and the Group*. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1958. v, 89 pp. \$1.00, paper.
- CROSS, BARBARA M. *Horace Bushnell: Minister to a Changing America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. xv, 201 pp. \$6.00.
- DAHLKE, H. OTTO. *Values in Culture and Classroom: A Study in the Sociology of the School*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. xvii, 572 pp. \$6.00.
- DAHRENDORF, RALF. *Soziale Klassen und Klassenkonflikt in der Industriellen Gesellschaft*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1957. xiii, 270 pp. DM 24.—.
- DARWIN, CHARLES. *The Origin of the Species*. With a special introduction by JULIAN HUXLEY. New York: New American Library, 1958. (A Mentor Book). xv, 479 pp. Fifty cents, paper.
- DE FLEUR, MELVIN L. and OTTO N. LARSEN. *The Flow of Information: An Experiment in Mass*

- Communication*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. xvii, 302 pp. \$4.50.
- DONAHUE, WILMA, WOODROW W. HUNTER, DOROTHY H. COONS, and HELEN K. MAURICE (Editors). *Free Time: Challenge to Later Maturity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958. xii, 172 pp. \$4.50.
- DUBE, S. C. *India's Changing Villages: Human Factors in Community Development*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958. xii, 230 pp. \$3.50.
- DUBOIS, PHILIP H. *Multivariate Correlational Analysis*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. xv, 202 pp. \$4.50.
- DUNHAM, ARTHUR. *Community Welfare Organization: Principles and Practice*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958. xii, 480 pp. \$5.75.
- ELLIOTT, GEORGE P. *Parktilden Village*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. 200 pp. \$3.50.
- FALS BORDA, ORLANDO and ERNESTO E. VAUTIER. *La Vivienda Tropical Humeda: Sus Aspectos Sociales Y Fisicos Como Se Observan En El Choco (Colombia)*. Bogotá: Centro Interamericano de Vivienda y Planeamiento, 1958. 18 pp., with illustrations. No price indicated, paper.
- FISHER, SEYMOUR and SIDNEY E. CLEVELAND. *Body Image and Personality*. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1958. xi, 420 pp. \$9.25.
- FORM, WILLIAM H. and SIGMUND NOSOW, with GREGORY P. STONE and CHARLES M. WESTIE. *Community in Disaster*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. xiv, 273 pp. \$4.00.
- FORMAN, LIONEL and E. S. SACHS. *The South African Treason Trial*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1958. 216 pp. \$5.00.
- (FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR). *Assessing Managerial Potential*. Ann Arbor: The Foundation, 1958. 83 pp. \$3.00, paper.
- FRIEDBURG, LUDWIG V. and FRIEDRICH WELTZ. *Altersbild und Altersvorsorge der Arbeiter und Angestellten*. Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1958. 87 pp. 6.80 DM, paper.
- FRIEDLANDER, WALTER A. (Editor). *Concepts and Methods of Social Work*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958. ix, 308 pp. \$4.50.
- GARIGUE, PHILIPPE. *Études Sur Le Canada Français*. Montreal: Faculté Des Sciences Sociales Économiques et Politiques Université de Montréal, 1958. 110 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- GINGER, RAY. *Six Days or Forever? Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. 258 pp. \$3.95.
- GINSBURG, NORTON and CHESTER F. ROBERTS, JR. *Malaya*. With the collaboration of LEONARD COMBER, BURTON STEIN, C. LESTER STERMER, and JOHN E. TROTTER. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1958. xi, 533 pp. \$6.00.
- GROSS, FELIKS. *Druga Rewolucja Przemysłowa*. Paris: Édition La Lumière "Swiatlo," 1958. 271 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- HAGEN, EVERETT E. *Handbook for Industry Studies*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958. x, 89 pp. No price indicated.
- HALPERN, JOEL MARTIN. *A Serbian Village*. Illustrations by BARBARA KERESKY HALPERN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. xxii, 325 pp. \$6.00.
- HARGREAVES, J. D. *A Life of Sir Samuel Lewis*. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. x, 112 pp. \$1.00.
- HARLAN, LOUIS R. *Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States 1901-1915*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958. xii, 290 pp. \$6.00.
- HAYDU, GEORGE G. *The Architecture of Sanity: The Story of Man's Growth and Competence*. New York: Julian Press, Inc., 1958. 238 pp. \$5.00.
- HAYS, H. R. *From Ape to Angel: An Informal History of Social Anthropology*. Drawings by SUE ALLEN. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958. xxii, 440, xv pp. \$7.50.
- HENDERSON, HUBERT. *Supply and Demand*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. xi, 142 pp. \$2.25.
- HENDRICK, IVES. *Facts and Theories of Psychoanalysis*. Third Edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958. xxi, 383, xvii pp. \$6.00.
- HIGGINS, LOIS LUNDELL and EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK. *Criminology and Crime Prevention*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1958. xii, 471 pp. \$8.50.
- HOEBEL, E. ADAMSON. *Man in the Primitive World: An Introduction to Anthropology*. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1958. xi, 678 pp. \$9.00.
- HOFFSOMMER, HAROLD. *The Sociology of American Life: An Introductory Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958. xi, 628 pp. \$7.50.
- (THE HOGG FOUNDATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH). *No Place for Tommy: Study Concerning Emotionally Disturbed Children in Texas*. Austin: The Foundation, by the University of Texas Printing Division, 1958. 50 pp. Twenty-five cents, paper.
- HOLLINGSHEAD, AUGUST B. and FREDERICK C. REDLICH. *Social Class and Mental Illness: A Community Study*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958. London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd. ix, 442 pp. \$7.50.
- HOLLINSHEAD, BYRON S. *Is European Education Better?* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958. 8 pp. Ten cents, paper.
- HOULT, THOMAS FORD. *The Sociology of Religion*. New York: Dryden Press, 1958. xii, 436 pp. \$5.25.
- HOWE, IRVING and LEWIS COSER. *The American Communist Party: A Critical History (1919-1957)*. With the assistance of JULIUS JACOBSON. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. x, 593 pp. \$6.75.
- (THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH). *Third Annual Report, November, 1956 to October, 1957*. Grahamstown, South Africa: Rhodes University, 1958. 41 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- (INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF SETTLEMENTS AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES). *Special Issue on Community Centres*, No. 1, 1958. Roma, Italia: International Review of Community Development. 213 pp. No price indicated.
- (INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE). *Social Security: A Workers' Education Manual*. Geneva: ILO, 1958. vi, 132 pp. Seventy-five cents, paper.
- JACOB, PHILIP E. *Changing Values in College: An*

- Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. xvi, 174 pp. \$3.50.
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN, GERTA HUTTL-WORTH, and JOHN FRED BEEBE. *Paleosiberian Peoples and Languages: A Bibliographical Guide.* New Haven: HRAF Press, 1958. vii, 222 pp. \$5.50.
- JAMES, WILLIAM. *The Varieties of Religious Experience.* With a foreword by JACQUES BARZUN. New York: New American Library, 1958. (A Mentor Book). xviii, 406 pp. Fifty cents, paper.
- JOHNSON, EUGENE I. *The Community Education Project: A Four-Year Report.* San Bernadino Valley College, California. White Plains, N. Y.: The Fund for Adult Education, 1958. 77 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- (JOINT COMMISSION ON MENTAL ILLNESS AND HEALTH). *Second Annual Report, 1957.* Cambridge: Headquarters, 808 Memorial Drive, n.d. 83 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- KENNEDY, WILLIAM F. *Humanist Versus Economist: The Economic Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1958. 96 pp. \$2.00, paper.
- KEY, V. O., JR. *Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups.* Fourth Edition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958. xiv, 783 pp. \$6.50.
- KRUGMAN, MORRIS (Editor). *Orthopsychiatry and the School.* New York: American Orthopsychiatric Association, Inc., 1958. xii, 265 pp. \$4.30.
- (LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTER, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY). *Economic and Social Implications of Automation: A Bibliographic Review.* By GLORIA CHEEK, Research Assistant. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1958. 125 pp. \$1.25, paper.
- LANDIS, PAUL H. *Introductory Sociology.* New York: Ronald Press Co., 1958. xxviii, 726 pp. \$6.50.
- LANG, GLADYS ENGEL (Editor). *Mental Health.* New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1958. 192 pp. \$2.00.
- LEAVITT, HAROLD J. *Managerial Psychology: An Introduction to Individuals, Pairs, and Groups in Organizations.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. xi, 335 pp. \$5.00.
- (THE LIFWYNN FOUNDATION). *A Search for Man's Sanity: The Selected Letters of Trigrant Burrow.* With Biographical Notes. Prepared by the Editorial Committee of the Foundation, WILLIAM E. GALT, Chairman. Foreword by SIR HERBERT READ. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. xxi, 615 pp. \$8.75.
- LORING, WILLIAM C. JR., FRANK L. SWEETSER, and CHARLES F. ERNST. *Community Organization for Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal.* Cambridge: Cambridge Press, Inc., 1957. xxix, 238 pp. No price indicated.
- LYND, HELEN MERRELL. *On Shame and the Search for Identity.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958. 318 pp. \$5.75.
- MCCLEERY, RICHARD H. *Policy Change in Prison Management: Foreword by ALEXANDER HEARD.* East Lansing: Governmental Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1957. 39 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- MEADOWS, PAUL. *El Proceso Social de La Revolucion.* Mexico, D. F.: Universidad Nacional, n.d. 223 pp. No price indicated.
- MEADOWS, PAUL. *La Tecnologia y El Orden Social: Disecciones del Industrialismo Moderno.* Mexico, D.F.: Universidad Nacional, n.d. No price indicated, paper.
- MELTZER, BERNARD N., HARRY R. DOBY, and PHILIP M. SMITH. *Education in Society: Readings.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958. xiv, 498 pp. \$3.25.
- MERCER, BLAINE E. *An Introduction to the Study of Sociology.* Introduction by ROBERT K. MERTON. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958. xvi, 640 pp. No price indicated.
- (MILBANK MEMORIAL FUND). *An Approach to the Prevention of Disability from Chronic Psychosis: The Open Mental Hospital Within the Community.* Report of the Second Meeting of the Advisory Council on Mental Health Demonstrations. New York: The Fund, 1958. 80 pp. \$1.00, paper.
- MILLER, ROBERT MOATS. *American Protestantism and Social Issues 1919-1939.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958. xiv, 385 pp. \$6.00.
- MILLS, THEODORE M. *Group Structure and The Newcomer: An Experimental Study of Group Expansion.* Oslo: Oslo University Press, 1957. 32 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- MORLAND, JOHN KENNETH. *Millways of Kent.* Third volume of "Field Studies in the Modern Culture of the South." Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958. xxii, 291 pp. \$5.00.
- MORRIS, TERENCE. *The Criminal Area: A Study in Social Ecology.* Foreword by HERMANN MANNHEIM. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958. New York: Humanities Press. xiii, 202 pp. 25 s. net.
- MOSER, C. A. *Survey Methods in Social Investigation.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1958. xiii, 352 pp. \$5.25.
- MYRDAL, GUNNAR. *Rich Lands and Poor: The Road to World Prosperity.* World Perspectives, Volume 16. Planned and edited by RUTH NANDA ANSHEN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 168 pp. \$2.25.
- (NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS). *Group Work Papers Presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, 1957.* New York: The Association, 1958. 82 pp. \$1.75, paper.
- (NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION). *Government-University Relationships in Federally Sponsored Scientific Research and Development.* Washington, D. C.: The Foundation, 1958. ix, 44 pp. For sale by Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C. Forty cents, paper.
- NERN, DANIEL D. *Black As Night.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. 261 pp. \$3.95.
- (NEW YORK STATE INTERDEPARTMENTAL HEALTH RESOURCES BOARD). *The Adjustment of Severely Retarded Adults in the Community: A Study of Former Pupils of Low IQ Classes Held by the Board of Education of the City of New York (1929-1956).* GERHART SAENGER, Director of

- Project Research. Albany: The Board, 1957. xix, 176 pp. No price indicated.
- OGBURN, WILLIAM F. and MEYER F. NIMKOFF. *Sociology*. Third Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958. x, 756 pp. \$6.75.
- OSSOWSKA, MARIA. *Podstawy Nauki O Moralnosci*. Watszawa: Panstowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1957. vii, 416 pp. No price indicated.
- PALOU, JEAN. *La Peur Dans L'Histoire*. Paris: Collection "Vous Connaitrez" Les Éditions Ouvrières, 1958. 127 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- (PAN AMERICAN UNION). *Organization of American States, Annual Report of the Secretary General 1956-1957*. Washington, D. C.: Pan American Union, 1957. vii, 211 pp. Fifty cents, paper.
- PANDIT, VIJAYA LAKSHMI. *The Evolution of India*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. vii, 46 pp. \$1.00.
- PARRINDER, GEOFFREY. *Witchcraft*. Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1958. (A Pelican Book). 208 pp. Eighty-five cents, paper.
- PATAI, RAPHAEL. *The Kingdom of Jordan*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1958. ix, 315 pp. \$5.00.
- PEPPER, STEPHEN C. *The Sources of Value*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1958. xiv, 732 pp. \$8.50.
- PHELPS, HAROLD A. and DAVID HENDERSON. *Population in Its Human Aspects*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958. xvi, 512 pp. \$6.00.
- PIEPER, FRANK. *Modular Management and Human Leadership*. Minneapolis: Methods Press, 1958. 288 pp. \$6.50.
- PIKE, E. ROYSTON. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Religions*. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1958. 404 pp. \$1.95, paper.
- REDFORD, EMMETTE S. *Ideal and Practice in Public Administration*. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1958. xii, 155 pp. \$2.50.
- (THE RELIGION AND LABOR FOUNDATION). *The Impact of Automation*. "On Production and Employment," by JAMES B. CAREY; "On Ethics and Culture," by MARGARET MEAD. Columbus, Ohio: The Foundation, 1958. Twenty-five cents, paper.
- ROSS, MURRAY G. *Case Histories in Community Organization*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. ix, 259 pp. \$3.50.
- RUUD, MILLARD H. *Interpretation of the Mental Health Code*. Austin: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, University of Texas, 1957. v, 47 pp. Twenty-five cents, paper.
- SANDERS, IRWIN T. *The Community: An Introduction to a Social System*. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1958. xvi, 431 pp. \$6.00.
- SARGENT, S. STANSFELD and ROBERT C. WILLIAMSON. *Social Psychology: An Introduction to the Study of Human Relations*. Second Edition. New York: Ronald Press, 1958. x, 649 pp. \$6.00.
- SCHLESINGER, JOSEPH A. *How They Became Governor: A Study of Comparative State Politics, 1870-1950*. Foreword by ROBERT A. DAHL. East Lansing: Governmental Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1957. 103 pp. No price indicated.
- (SCHWEIZERISCHES SOZIALARCHIV). *50 Jahre Schweizerisches Sozialarchiv: 1907-1957*. Verfasst von EUGEN STEINEMANN und EDUARD EICHHOLZER. Zürich: Schweizerisches Sozialarchiv, 1958. 48 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- SHIELDS, CURRIN. *Democracy and Catholicism in America*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1958. ix, 310 pp. \$5.00.
- SIEGLE, PETER E. *New Directions in Liberal Education for Executives*. White Plains, N. Y.: Fund for Adult Education, 1958. v, 74 pp. Twenty-five cents, paper.
- SKINNER, G. WILLIAM. *Leadership and Power in the Chinese Community of Thailand*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958. xvii, 363 pp. \$6.50.
- SMITH, BERT KRUGER. *The Opening Door: A Report on Texas State Hospitals*. Austin: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, by the University of Texas Printing Division, 1958. 50 pp. Twenty-five cents, paper.
- SMITH, CHARLES U. and LEWIS M. KILLIAN. *The Tallahassee Bus Protest: Field Reports on Desegregation in the South*. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith with the cooperation of the Committee on Intergroup Relations, Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1958. 23 pp. Twenty-five cents, paper.
- (SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL). *Annual Report 1956-1957*. New York: The Council, 230 Park Avenue, n.d., 90 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- SOULE, GEORGE. *The Shape of Tomorrow*. New York: New American Library, 1958. (A Signet Key Book). 141 pp. Thirty-five cents, paper.
- STEICHEN, EDWARD. *The Family of Man*. New York: Maco Magazine Corp., for the Museum of Modern Art, 1958. 256 pp. Fifty cents, paper.
- STRAUSZ-HUPÉ, ROBERT and HARRY W. HAZARD (Editors). *The Idea of Colonialism*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1958. 496 pp. \$5.00.
- SUMMERS, MONTAGUE. *The Geography of Witchcraft*. Evanston & New York: University Books, 1958. 623 pp. \$7.50.
- TETENS, CAPTAIN ALFRED. *Among the Savages of the South Seas: Memoirs of Micronesia, 1862-1868*. Translated from the German by FLORENCE MANN SPOEHR. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958 xxxvi, 107 pp. \$3.75.
- THORPE, EARL E. *Negro Historians in the United States*. Baton Rouge: Fraternal Press, 1958. xi, 188 pp. No price indicated.
- TYLOR, EDWARD BURNETT. *The Origins of Culture*. With an introduction by PAUL RADIN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. (Harper Torchbooks). xv, 416 pp., index. \$1.75, paper.
- TYLOR, EDWARD BURNETT. *Religion in Primitive Culture*. With an introduction by PAUL RADIN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958 (Harper Torchbooks). xvii, 539 pp. \$1.95, paper.
- VEBLIN, THORSTEIN. *The Theory of Business Enterprise*. New York: New American Library, 1958. (A Mentor Book). 223 pp. Fifty cents, paper.
- VIDART, DANIEL D. *La Vida Rural Uruguaya*. Montevideo: Departamento de Sociologia Rural, 1955. 211 pp. No price indicated, paper.
- VOLD, GEORGE B. *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. xi, 334 pp. \$5.00.

- WEBSTER, DONALD H. *Urban Planning and Municipal Public Policy*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. xii, 572 pp. \$6.00.
- WHEELER, WAYNE (Editor). *The Other-Directed Man: Concept and Reality*. Parkville, Missouri: Park College Press, 1958. 34 pp. \$1.50, paper.
- WINTER, GIBSON. *Love and Conflict: New Patterns in Family Life*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958. 191 pp. \$3.50.
- WOLFSON, FRED. *Pageant of Ghana*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. xiii, 266 pp. \$4.80.
- WREN, MELVIN C. *The Course of Russian History*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1958. xiii, 725 pp. \$6.95.
- YOUNG, ROLAND (Editor). *Approaches to the Study of Politics: Twenty-Two Contemporary Essays Exploring the Nature of Politics and Methods by Which It Can Be Studied*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1958. xxx, 382 pp. No price indicated.
- ZINKIN, TAYA. *India Changes!* New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. xii, 233 pp. \$5.00.

INDEX
to the
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Revised 1956 Edition

This VOLUME lists all book reviews and classifies articles for the entire twenty volumes of the *American Sociological Review* according to:

AUTHOR • SUBJECT MATTER

It is indispensable as a research tool and for keeping abreast of recent trends in sociology. Price \$2.50

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON SQUARE

NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

When writing advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

The American Sociological Review

Bi-Monthly

\$8 per year

Official Journal of the Society

Publishes the best writings in the field.

Reflects new trends and developments.

Reviews the most important new books on sociology and related fields.

Publications of *The American Sociological Society*

Index to the American Sociological Review

Revised 1956 Edition

\$2.50

Classifies by author and subject all articles and book reviews for the entire 20 volumes.

Indispensable research tool.

Sociometry

A Quarterly Journal of
Research in
Social Psychology

\$9 per year

\$4.50 to members

Reports on entire range of research in social psychology.

Offers scholars material on the latest findings and on recently developed methods.

*American
Sociological
Society*

New York University

Washington Square New York 3

When writing Advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

ACTA SOCIOLOGICA

Scandinavian Review of Sociology
Skandinavische Zeitschrift für Soziologie
Revue Scandinave de Sociologie

CONTENTS

Vol. 3, fasc. 1:

Hans L. Zetterberg: Compliant Actions
Bo Anderson: Some Notes on Operationism and the Concept of Validity
Joachim Israel: Remarks Concerning Generalization in Group-Experimental Research
Rafael Helanko: Sports and Socialization

In coming issues:

Verner Goldschmidt: Social Role of the Judicial Authorities
P. Sloth Carlsen and Martin Ulv: A Study in Notability
Jørgen Andersen: On the Theory of Social Medicine
Sverre Holm and Stein Rokkan: Sociology in Norway
Heikki Waris: Sociology in Finland
Torben Agersnap: Distance and Internal Migration

ACTA SOCIOLOGICA

is published quarterly in English, German or French. Subscriptions are by one volume only. Orders should be made to Ejnar Munksgaard, Nørregade 6, Copenhagen, Denmark, or to any international bookseller. The subscription price is Dan.Cr. 40.- per volume + postage.

The International Journal of Social Psychiatry Spring, 1958

This issue will include the following articles:—

SOME PROBLEMS OF TRANSCULTURAL PSYCHIATRY

E. D. Wittkower and J. Fried

SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS

David M. Kissen

SOME ASPECTS OF THE WORK OF A REGIONAL MENTAL

HOSPITAL AND OF AN OBSERVATION WARD

J. Hoenig and I. M. Crotty

AMERICAN COMMUNITIES IN FOREIGN SETTINGS:

GROUP PROBLEMS AND AN AMERICAN FAMILY GROUP THERAPY PROGRAMME IN GERMANY

William R. Perl

TWO TRIALS WITH REHEARSED PSYCHODRAMA

Oskar Jerzy Slowik

CLINICAL EVALUATIONS OF HOSPITALIZED EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN AS A FUNCTION OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SOPHISTICATION

Antony Davids and F. Robert Rodman

REPORTS AND REVIEWS

Annual Subscription (Four Issues)

£2—\$8 for Hospitals, Libraries, Firms, Government Dept., etc.

£1.5s—\$5 for individual subscribers who certify that the Journal is for their personal use.

All enquiries should be addressed to

The Secretary—INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY

9 Fellows Road, London N.W.3.

When writing Advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC and CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION



INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE BULLETIN

A quarterly publication. Subscription, \$3.50 a year. Single copies, \$1.00.

Just issued: Volume X, Number 2

The Role of the Executive in the Modern State (Canada, France,
USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia)

Also now ready:

the first volume in a new series of bibliographies prepared by the
International Committee for Social Science Documentation:

**INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHRO-
POLOGY, Vol. I**

covering works published in 1955, prepared in cooperation with the
International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences.

259 Pages

\$5.50

And:

INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ECONOMICS, Vol. V

covering works published in 1956, prepared in cooperation with the
International Economic Association.

474 Pages

\$8.00

Also available:

INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOCIOLOGY, Vol. VI

272 Pages

\$6.00

INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, Vol. V

296 Pages

\$6.00

*Place your order for single copies or standing order for the series
with:*

UNESCO PUBLICATIONS CENTER

801 Third Avenue

New York 22, New York

When writing advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

***If you are LOOKING FOR A JOB—
If you have a VACANCY TO FILL—***

**SEND DETAILS FOR LISTING IN THE SOCIETY'S
EMPLOYMENT BULLETIN**

- issued nearly every month
- providing complete anonymity to both applicant and listor of vacancy
- bringing together prospective employers and employees
- entailing no obligation to acknowledge replies which come to you, unless they are of real interest
- eliciting hundreds of answers each month
- resulting in many actual placements

Members say:

"practical and fills a real professional need"

"especially valuable in placing the right people in the right places"

"a help in advising students on occupational opportunities"

Employers say:

"an amazing way of smoking out candidates whom you would never suspect of wanting to move from their present positions"

"we received over thirty replies and were both pleased and surprised at their calibre. Ten of them could qualify for top positions in almost any first-class institution"

"we anticipate completing the staff from the applications received"

THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

New York University, Washington Square, New York 3, N.Y.

When writing advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Outstanding Sociology Textbooks

for principles

INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY—5th Edition

Sutherland—Woodward—Maxwell

A comprehensive and appealing introduction to sociology; a well-organized textbook that provides the student with a fundamental basis for understanding the social structure and organization of man in society. The *revision* draws a sharper, clearer analysis of sociology, culture, and the social sciences. Includes, also, many new illustrations and fine case materials. **\$6.50**

for criminology

PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY—5th Edition

E. H. Sutherland—Rev. by D. R. Cressey

The major definitive text, incorporating in the revision, a better application of the Sutherland theory to the material on the control of crime. 'Perhaps the most influential book in the field'. **\$6.75**

for marriage and family

FAMILY DEVELOPMENT (1957)

Evelyn M. Duvall

An outstanding authority has written—using proven techniques—a dynamic, modern approach to the contemporary family, and a realistic appraisal of its problems and situations. Lists 'developmental tasks' for each family member for achieving harmonious adjustment within and without the family group. **\$6.00**

for social science

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL SCIENCE—Rev.

Calhoun, Nelson, Papandreou, Naftalin, and Sibley

A brilliant synthesis of the major ideas, institutions, and philosophies of modern society examined within the framework of three parts—Personality, Work, and Community. 25% new readings included recently. New supplement to Instructor's Manual available. **\$8.00**

Other fine texts and references also published

Examination copies and brochures available upon request

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

333 W. Lake St.

Chicago 6, Ill.

When writing Advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Children of the Kibbutz

MELFORD E. SPIRO here presents the results of an on-the-spot study of the unique educational system found in an Israeli kibbutz. From infancy on, the children live not with their families but with a group of age-peers, in a society stressing cooperative living, the sharing of property, an ethic of mutual aid, an emphasis on physical labor, and a secular view. How this affects their attitudes toward others, within and outside the group becomes a fascinating study of the relation between socialization and personality development. Formal and informal interviews, psychological tests, and a careful analysis of documentary materials add depth to the author's own observations and conclusions. \$10.00

The Psychiatric Hospital as a Small Society

By **WILLIAM CAUDILL**. Because in-patient therapy does not take place in a vacuum, an understanding of the emotional interaction within the social microcosm of the mental hospital is vital to effective therapy and administration. As a resident observer, Dr. Caudill studied both patients and personnel on the wards, at staff meetings, through therapy-hour notes, and in interviews using an original "picture interpretation" technique. The result is a detailed, comprehensive analysis of interrelations within the overt formal and informal structure of the hospital, and within its covert emotional structure. In addition, his unique reconstruction of the events leading to a major patient disturbance during his stay at the hospital is an invaluable guide to all hospital administrators. A COMMONWEALTH FUND BOOK. \$6.50



Through your bookseller, or from

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

When writing Advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

"The most emulated text in recent years"

SOCIOLOGY:

A Text with Adapted Readings

Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick

Second Edition Ready for Your Fall Classes

- ★ Chapter 2, "Social Organization," has been considerably simplified; now includes a discussion of social roles
- ★ Chapter 3, "Culture," includes much new material
- ★ Chapter 4, "Socialization," now includes a brilliant *précis* of G. H. Mead's *Mind, Self, and Society*
- ★ Chapters 1, 6, 10, 13, and 15 partially rewritten
- ★ Data brought up to date throughout the book
- ★ Striking new photos. . . . New charts and tables

Most changes appear in Part One. The structure and scope of the book, so widely approved, remain the same as before.

xvii + 660 pp.

Price: \$6.50

Row, Peterson and Company

Publishers of Good Books in Evanston, Illinois

When writing Advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Selected RONALD Books . . .

THE FAMILY: As Process and Institution

Clifford Kirkpatrick, *Indiana University*

This integrated textbook examines the nature and origins, the types and dilemmas of families. It views the family process as successive family dramas in a dynamic and often inconsistent cultural environment, focusing on the life cycle of family experience. Throughout, theory is combined with empirical research findings. *"An insightful, scholarly textbook."* **Gerald R. Leslie, *Purdue University*. 104 ills., tables; 651 pp.**

CRIMINOLOGY

Robert G. Caldwell, *State University of Iowa*

An informative approach to the study of crime and delinquency. Authoritative textbook uses the resources of many fields to discuss the historical and contemporary aspects of crime, law enforcement, and penal administration. Fully covers criminal investigation and military justice; includes an inmate's account of prison life. *"Narrows the gap between the academic and penal worlds."* **Clyde Vedder, *University of Houston*. 38 ills., tables; 749 pp.**

INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY

Paul H. Landis, *State College of Washington*

April 7, 1958. Basic textbook presents an extensive and systematic treatment of social structure; discusses the roles and statuses of the sexes, of age and occupational groups; analyzes the factors of racial segregation, religion, etc. It contains much interesting case material which is brief and well integrated with the text. The numerous illustrations present important data and point up basic sociological principles. **158 ills.; 726 pp.**

SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION

Robert E. L. Faris, *University of Washington*

This outstanding college textbook analyzes clearly and understandably the key concepts of social organization and disorganization, and personal disorganization. It draws on materials from the whole field of sociology and related disciplines. Discusses social reorganization and social stability. Contains case illustrations throughout. *"Interesting, informative, and up to date."* **E. A. Huth, *University of Dayton* 2nd Ed. 664 pp.**

THE RONALD PRESS COMPANY

15 East 26th Street, New York 10, New York

When writing Advertisers please mention the AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

A publication of

THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

SOCIOMETRY

**A JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**PREVIOUS ISSUES HAVE
INCLUDED ARTICLES ON:**

Leaflet message diffusion
Differential social perception
Group norms of bomber crews
Personality and group position

Architecture and social interaction
Opposite sex sociometric choices
Sex role in jury deliberation
Measurement of status perception
Dimensions of group behavior
Assessment of persuasibility
Leadership theory
Index of marital integration
Interpersonal perception
The compensation of executives
Leadership and social change

**\$9.00 per year for four issues—SPECIAL RATE TO MEMBERS
of the American Sociological Society—\$4.50**

*Announcing the third of a series of publications
on sociology and social practice —*

SOCIOLOGY AND THE FIELD OF EDUCATION



*Prepared for the
American Sociological Society
By ORVILLE G. BRIM, JR.
Sociologist, Russell Sage Foundation*

Price, \$1.00

Special price to members of American Sociological Society,
75 cents

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

505 Park Avenue

New York 22, N. Y.